

SEP 22 1924

DOUBLE NUMBER, PRICE 3s.

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the Organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, July, and October; the REVIEW in the other eight months.

The Classical Review

EDITORS [E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
[Prof. W. M. CALDER, M.A., 5, Derby Road, Withington, Manchester.

All correspondence should be addressed to Prof. CALDER. Books for review should be sent to the Publisher.

Board of Management:

Prof. J. E. DOBSON, M.A., *Chairman*.
Prof. A. C. CLARK, Litt.D., F.R.A., *Non-Treasurer*.
Prof. E. E. CONWAY, Litt.D., F.R.A., *With the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary, representing the Council of the Classical Association*.
Prof. H. WILLIAMSON, M.A., *With the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary, representing the Council of the Classical Association*.
I. WHIBLEY, M.A., *Hon. Secretary*.
A. D. GODLEY, D.Litt., *Representing the Oxford Philological Society*.
Prof. SIR WILLIAM RIDGEWAY, D.Litt., Litt.D., Sc.D., LL.D., F.R.A., *Representing the Cambridge Philological Society*.

With the co-operation of Prof. WM. GARDNER HALE, University of Chicago;

Prof. MAURICE HUTTON, University of Toronto;

Prof. T. G. TUCKER, Litt.D., Melbourne.

Vol. XXXVIII AUGUST-SEPTEMBER, 1924 Nos. 5, 6

CONTENTS

PAGE	REVIEWS (continued):	PAGE
EDITORIAL NOTES AND NEWS ... 97	<i>in Athenian Empire</i> (Robertson), M. CARY, 131; Plato (Bude): <i>Protagoras</i> , Gorgias, <i>Meno</i> , <i>Parmenides</i> , <i>Theaetetus</i> , W. R. M. LAMB, 131, 132, 133; <i>Xenophon, Anabasis</i> (Brownson), <i>Symposium and Apology</i> (Todd), <i>Memorabilia and Oeconomicus</i> (Marchant), H. RACKHAM, 133; <i>Le Latin</i> (Marouzeau), G. E. K. BRAUNHOLTZ, 133; <i>Inscriptions Romaines</i> (Perret); <i>Divisions administratives de l'Espagne romaine</i> (Albertini); <i>Tacitus Germania</i> (Schwyzer), J. G. C. ANDERSON, 134, 135; <i>Das Schicksal als poetische Idee bei Homer</i> (Eberhard), R. B. ONIANS, 135; <i>Strassburg Osttrake</i> (Viereck), H. I. BELL, 136; <i>Three Measures of Meal</i> (Vial), J. N. FARQUHAR, 136; <i>Horace at Tibur</i> , etc. (Hallam), G. E. K. BRAUNHOLTZ, 137; <i>Saggi Glottologici</i> (Cocchia), J. WHATMOUGH, 137; <i>Solution of Homeric Question</i> (Smith); <i>Epilegomena ad Homerum</i> (Gyomlay), A. SHEWAN, 138; <i>Roman Home Life</i> , etc. (Rogers and Harley); <i>Etude sur 'l'amen' (la Harpe)</i> ; <i>Ad Herennium</i> (Mey); <i>Cornelius Nepos</i> (Guillemin); <i>Studia Ammianus</i> (Hagendahl); <i>Grægor von Tours</i> (Mori); <i>Julius de Toledo De Vita et Figuris</i> (Lindsay); <i>P. Petrarque Epist. Sol.</i> (Johnson), A. SOUTER, 138, 139, 140; <i>Greek and Roman Portraits</i> , etc. (Foulson), A. S. F. GOW, 140; <i>Theories of Metempsychosis</i> , etc. (Conger), F. M. CORNFORD, 140; <i>Manuel de Linguistique grecque</i> (Carroty), R. MCKENZIE, 140; <i>Fontes Hist. Æg. Egypt. III</i> (Hopkins), T. E. PERT, 141	
VERSION. GILBERT NORWOOD ... 97	OXFORD PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY'S REPORT ... 141	
THE INTERPRETATION OF AESCHYLUS' <i>Persæ</i> . J. D. CRAIG ... 98	SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS ... 141	
THE KERKIRAS PAPYRUS. A. D. KNOX ... 107	BOOKS RECEIVED ... 142	
THE HISTORICAL IMPORTANCE OF CULT-ASSOCIATIONS. A. D. KNOX ... 105		
AESCHYLUS. D. S. ROBERTSON ... 109		
TACITUS, <i>Annals</i> , XVI. 21. A. W. VAN BUREN ... 110		
MARTIAL IV. 64. E. H. ALTON ... 111		
POSTSCRIPT TO C.R. XXXVIII, p. 64. H. J. ROSE ... 112		
VITROVIVUS VII, pref. 12. F. GRANGER ... 112		
GRATTIANA. C. BRARMAN ... 112		
AESCHYLUS, <i>Ennemides</i> 945. F. M. CORNFORD ... 113		
THE TEARS OF NANNAKOS. W. M. CALDER ... 113		
NOTES ON TRYPHIODORUS AND OTHERS. T. W. LUMB ... 113		
REVIEWS:		
<i>Roman Poetry</i> (Sikes), J. W. MACFARL, 113; <i>The Legacy of Rome</i> , A. W. GOMME, 116; <i>The Hope Valley</i> (Tillyard), MARY BRAUNHOLTZ, 117; <i>The Craft of Athenian Pottery</i> (Richter), E. M. W. TILLYARD, 120; <i>Aristotle's Problems</i> (Ruelle-Knoellinger-Klek), E. S. FOSTER, 121; <i>Schools of Gaul</i> (Haarhoff), W. B. ANDERSON, 122; <i>The Mænechmus Anaxagoras</i> (Hardy), M. P. CHARLESWORTH, 123; <i>Correlativity and Solidarity</i> (Wylie), W. W. BUCKLAND, 124; <i>Cicero: Pro Archia</i> , etc. (Watts), A. C. CLARK, 125; <i>American Grammatical Nomenclature</i> , E. A. SONNENSCHEIN, 126; <i>Thucydides I. (Laskaris)</i> , A. W. GOMME, 127; <i>Adriana Seneca</i> (Walker), A. C. PEARSON, 128; <i>Cicero and his Influence</i> (Rolle), M. P. CHARLESWORTH, 130; <i>Justice</i>		

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 151-155, WEST 25TH STREET.

Price for Double Numbers, 3s. net. Yearly Subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$3. Combined Yearly Subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$6.25.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices, provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public.

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Prof. H. A. Ormerod, 46, Cliff Road, Hyde Park, Leeds; or to either of the Hon. Secretaries, Rev. G. C. Richards, Oriel College, Oxford, and Mr. M. P. Charlesworth, St. John's College, Cambridge; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Mr. E. W. V. Clifton, 11, Meadow Bank, Chorltonville, near Manchester; Dr. G. A. Auden, Education Office, Margaret Street, Birmingham; Miss F. M. Rees, The University, Liverpool; Mr. E. P. Barker, 426, Woodborough Road, Nottingham; Miss P. K. Downes, Redland High School, Bristol; Mr. Basil Anderton, The Public Library, New Bridge Street, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Miss C. E. Parker, Westfield College, Hampstead; Mr. W. E. Nash-Williams, University College, Cardiff; Mr. E. E. Bibby, The University, Leeds; Miss E. M. Watson, Central Girls' School, Sheffield; Mr. E. D. T. Jenkins, University College, Aberystwyth; Mr. J. Whatmough, University College, Bangor; Miss Buckley, Simon Langton School for Girls, Canterbury; Miss D. J. L. Poole, 19, Banbury Road, Oxford; Mr. J. M. Gaussen, 16, Lewes Crescent, Brighton; Mr. A. B. Jeffries, 100, Cedar Road, Southampton; Mr. F. Fletcher, University College, Exeter; and Mr. C. W. Baty, 49, Waterloo Road, Bedford.

REVISED EDITION A CONCISE DICTIONARY OF GREEK AND ROMAN ANTIQUITIES

Based on Sir Wm. Smith's larger Dictionary, and incorporating the Results of Modern Research. Edited by F. WARR, CORNISH, M.A., Vice-Provost of Eton College. With over 1,100 Illustrations taken from the best examples of Ancient Art. 25s. net.

This Dictionary forms a companion volume to the *Classical Dictionary*. In the revised edition the results of recent discoveries, as well as the researches of English and foreign scholars, have been incorporated.

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE ST., LONDON, W.C.1

BOOKS FOR ALL EXAMINATIONS

NEW AND SECOND-HAND
CLASSICS A SPECIALITY

J. POOLE & CO.

86 CHARING CROSS ROAD
LONDON, W.C.2

READY IN SEPTEMBER—7s. 6d. net

AN ETYMOLOGICAL DICTIONARY OF MODERN ENGLISH

By ERNEST WEEKLEY, M.A., Author of 'The Romance of Words,' 'Surnames,' etc. Cheaper Edition. Large Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.

The 'Concise' edition of Professor Ernest Weekley's *Etymological Dictionary of Modern English* puts the latest results of etymological research within the reach of the most modest purses. The abridgment has not involved any diminution in the vocabulary; in fact, many new words such as *copier*, *fascist*, *insulin*, *rodpo*, etc., are here registered for the first time. The reduction in bulk has been effected by brevity of explanation.

An Etymological Dictionary of Modern English. By ERNEST WEEKLEY, M.A. Crown 4to. £2 2s. net.

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, LONDON, W.C.1

V
qua
autu
Gui
Asse
som
cert
Uni
foun
as A
peuv
Hav
' To
c'est
Lou
l'As
prob
Étu
Soci

Έστ
φέγ
ἀφθ

ὅππ
ἂ π
κυμ

καὶ
ἐντυ

NO

The Classical Review

AUGUST—SEPTEMBER, 1924

EDITORIAL NOTES AND NEWS

WE welcome two new classical quarterlies from France, both born last autumn. The *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé* cleaves close to the Association and its excellent work, and some of the articles are prefatory to certain volumes of the Collection des Universités de France; but room is found for a few more general papers, such as A. Meillet's 'Ce que les linguistes peuvent souhaiter d'une édition,' or L. Havet's page on the duty of orthography: 'Tous les ans je dis à mes élèves que c'est une probité de prononcer *Kikero* et *Lougdounoum*. L'orthographe latine de l'Association Guillaume Budé est une probité, elle aussi.' The *Revue des Études Latines* is the organ of the Société des Études Latines, which was

founded early in 1923. The first number includes Havet's latest views on Palaeographic Man, a survey of the present state of the study of mediaeval Latin, and a few reviews.

We hear on good authority the news of the discovery, at Leyden, of a palimpsest of Sophocles, own brother to *L*, with the same *scholia* and all. Much can be read, and the manuscript is to be published; it is hoped that a photographic process will shew up the nether script. Unfortunately, the prospects of improving the text from this source appear to be slight: the new readings have been pronounced to be for the most part slips which were corrected at once.

VERSION

HIS LAST SONNET.

BRIGHT Star! would I were steadfast as thou art—

Not in lone splendour hung aloft the night,

And watching, with eternal lids apart,

Like Nature's patient, sleepless Eremité,

The moving waters at their priest-like task

Of pure ablution round earth's human shores,

Or gazing on the new soft fallen mask

Of snow upon the mountains and the moors—

No—yet still steadfast, still unchangeable,

Pillow'd upon my fair love's ripening breast,

To feel for ever its soft fall and swell,

Awake for ever in a sweet unrest,

Still, still to hear her tender-taken breath,

And so live ever—or else swoon to death.

JOHN KEATS.

Φέσπερ' ὦ πῆλαινγες, ἐπικρέμασθεν
φέγγος ἐξ ὀφνῶς ὀνέχων ἔρημον,
ἀφθίταν ὦραν πρόπολος τὴν μὲν δέ-
δορκας αὔπνος,

ὅππ' ἐρείσῃς ἀκάματον, θάλασσαν
ἂ παρ' ἄκταις πάντοσ' ἐπιρρέοισα
κυμάτων λώτροισι βρότων ἄλιτρα
πάντα κοθαίρει,

καὶ πλάκας τ' ἄθρης κορύφαις τ' ὀρένναις
ἐντυπᾶς χθίσδα χιονὶ χνοαΐσαις,

τοὶ δὲ κήνων μὲν πεδέχην ἐμὸν κῆρ
οὐ τι ποθήει,

ἀλλὰ κῆγων αἶθ' ἴσα τοὶ βέβαιος
στήθεσ' ὠραίοισι κόρας ἐράννας
προσκληθείην τὰν κεφάλαν, τὰ δὲ με-
μήποτα λάθοι

ἤρεμ' αἰωρήμεν', ἔγω δ' αὔπνος
ἄβρα πνευσίσας χάριτι πτοάθεις
ὦδ' αἶ ζῶν θέλω, ἢ κρετήθεις
ἦκα θανοίην.

GILBERT NORWOOD.

G

THE INTERPRETATION OF AESCHYLUS' *PERSAE*.

A CENTURY ago, Blomfield, in the introduction to his edition of the *Persae*, made the following observation: 'Est autem fatendum Aeschylum in Persarum exodo aliquantum a dignitate tragoediae descivisse. Valde enim ridicula est Xerxis persona cum lamentis suis, et laceris pannis, et vacua pharetra: sed longe magis ridiculum Chori obsequium, dum varios doloris exprimendi modos, a Xerxe edoctus, adhibet. Verum hoc a poeta consilio factum fuisse arbitror, ut Atheniensibus risum moveret.' A German scholar, Siebelis (whose work I have been unable to procure), detected a spirit of ridicule in the messenger's speech. Others, on the same evidence, have accused Aeschylus of a lapse from his usual tragic dignity. G. Hermann and M. Patin, to take two instances on the opposite side, have met these statements with a flat denial.

The difference of opinion is interesting, and raises a question of fundamental importance for the understanding of the *Persae*. Everything depends on the standpoint from which we view the play. The question, to put the contrast in its extremest form, is whether we are to regard the *Persae* as the tragedy of the Persians or as the dramatic representation of the triumph of Hellas over the barbarian. The first interpretation extends a measure of sympathy to the anxious old guardians, lays stress on the motherly solicitude of Atossa, represents the messenger as purely and simply overcome with the disaster to his countrymen, depicts Darius as uttering a warning against vainglory to the Greeks, and tends to mitigate the final humiliation of Xerxes. The second recognises some of these elements, but keeps them strictly subordinate to the main theme of the victory of Greece and the discomfiture of her enemy.

I propose to make a rapid survey of the *Persae* from the second point of view, and to attempt to show that 'comic' or 'undignified' features exist and are essential, but that they admit of an interpretation which is less unworthy of Aeschylus and his audience.

For the sake of convenience I shall criticise some opinions put forward by M. Patin in his chapter on the *Persae* in *Études sur les Tragiques Grecs*. That eloquent critic, to whom students of Greek tragedy owe so much, has analysed our play with masterly insight, but, in his zeal to combat the idea of an element of satire or un-tragic humour, appears to have weakened his own argument.

Before going any further, however, it is necessary to form a clear conception of the setting and the special occasion of the *Persae*. All Greek plays require for their proper appreciation a knowledge of Greek ways of thinking. The *Persae*, above all others, for the very reason that it is concerned with an historical event, demands that we should enter to the fullest possible extent into the mind of the Athenians, who were intimately connected with that event and presumably felt strongly about it. Eight years before the performance they had, by a supreme effort, beaten back the invading hordes of Persia, and freed themselves from slavery. Their enemy was still a power to reckon with. It was not till four years later that the victory on the Eurymedon drove him from the coast of Asia Minor. Athens, as the head of a league, was still engaged in winning back the towns and islands (Greek towns and islands) which had once been subject to the Mede. Whatever may have been the impression made by the first play of the trilogy, the *Phineus*, we can imagine the intense excitement of the audience when the time came for the presentation of the drama of Salamis and Plataea, with a cast of Persians. Incidentally it may be noticed that the dramatic genius of Aeschylus does not consist in his having put Persians on the stage. It is difficult to see how a tragedy could have been composed except by choosing the vanquished as the dramatis personae. Phrynichus had made a mistake in judgment in dramatising the capture of Miletus at all, and suffered for wounding the susceptibilities of his audience. He was on safe ground when he repeated

the experiment with the *Phoenissae*, anticipating Aeschylus in his subject and in the first prize which marked its approval. Dramatic skill consisted far more in making a striking and dignified use of the given material. To return—is it likely that the Athenians were going to look on as neutrals, and extend to the Persians that measure of sympathy which would lead to the tragic *κάθαρσις* of pity and terror in view of their sufferings? It would be safer not to apply that principle at all. The *Persae* is unlike other dramas. But there was no lack of interest and of heightened emotion inherent in the subject. They were to witness the punishment of *ἄβρις*, and the chastisement was to be at their own hands.

Keeping this in mind we may go on to examine the play more in detail. The opening Chorus, in spite of the forebodings of the old men, presents a vivid, even menacing, picture of the mustering of the great army. From Persia, Egypt, Lydia, Mysia, and Babylon, they come, *δυναῖς βασιλέως ὑπὸ πομπαῖς*. They are represented as a torrent, a resistless sea-wave—*ἀπρόσοιστος γὰρ ὁ Περσῶν στρατὸς ἀλκίφρων τε λαός*. And there is the great King himself, with the dark steely eye of a deadly python, mounted on his Syrian chariot, and filled with his grandiose scheme of conquest—*ἐπὶ πᾶσαν χθόνα ποιμανόριον θεῖον ἐλαύνει*. The gloomy premonitions of the Chorus should be regarded, from the standpoint of the Athenians, as an anticipation, designed to rouse interest and curiosity, of *what they knew was coming*. It put them in the right frame of mind by hinting at divine powers (*ἀπάταν θεοῦ*) at work behind the scenes.

This mood of anticipation is intensified by Atossa's account of her dream and of the portent of the eagle and the hawk. The disaster is drawing near, so near that she betrays herself with an 'if,' but tries to cover up the unlucky admission by quickly adding—'he cannot be called to account by the state, and in any case if he escapes alive he is ruler of the land.'

The elders give an encouraging interpretation of the dream, and then we come to fourteen lines of *στιχομυθία* following on Atossa's question, 'In

what part of the world do they say Athens is situated?' Among other explanations it has been suggested (e.g. by Patin) that such a question would seem natural in view of the secluded life of women in antiquity. But it is not historically true of Atossa, if we are to believe Herodotus; and we have no right to suppose that Aeschylus was not as well-informed as his contemporaries. Would it not be more reasonable to suppose that we are here dealing with that kind of 'oratio obliqua' which pervades the whole play? We have had a description of the Persian armada. The time has come for a companion picture of the Greeks; and, though it occupies little space, we can imagine nothing finer. The audience must have glowed as they listened to their own praises, more significant in the mouths of Persians in distant Susa; and what deep chords must have vibrated to these lines:

AT. τίς δὲ ποιμάνωρ ἔπεισι κάπιδεσπόζει στρατῷ;
XO. οὐτινος δούλοι κέκληνται φωτὸς οὐδ' ὑπήκοοι.

The messenger enters at line 249, and his narrative, starting amid the lamentations of the Chorus, then guided, after she has broken her dramatic silence, by the questions of Atossa, holds our attention till line 514. I shall not enlarge on the well-known merits of this splendid piece of descriptive writing, but confine myself to certain features which bear on the present argument. The tone of the narrative is defined by a number of expressions, which commentators have noticed, but which give rise to different explanations. Let us take one by way of example.

καὶ Μᾶγος Ἀραβος, Ἀράβης τε Βάκτριος
σκληρὰς μέτοικος γῆς ἐκεῖ κατέφθιτο.

'A settler in a rugged land.' It is not enough to say that the messenger is merely speaking in character like the watchman of the *Agamemnon*, or with *une sorte de complaisance* in his tale of woe—as Patin remarks, supporting his view by an interesting quotation, from Scott's *Fair Maid of Perth*, about the common foible of inferiors when they thus find themselves an object of importance in the eyes of their superiors. Xerxes himself uses words with exactly the same nuance, *στυφελοῦ θείνοντας ἐπ' ἀκτᾶς* (964-5, cp. 303). Nor is it true to say

here that these expressions rise naturally to the lips of a man overcome with the pathos of an overwhelming change of fortune. Are they then *un appel volontaire à la gaieté des Athéniens*, the view of Siebelis as stated, to be strongly condemned, by Patin? If I am right about the attitude of the audience, they were an appeal, but certainly not to *gaieté*. The Athenians remembered the hardships of the migration to Salamis, the burning of Athens, the awful suspense, the hard knocks of the battle, and their unexpected triumph. And Aeschylus remembered as well as anyone. These expressions appeal to a deep sense of danger overpast, of the aggressor's fall; a feeling which is gratified here by pictures of Artembares 'being dashed against the rocky shores of Sileniae,' of Dadakes 'under the shock of a spear leaping with a light spring overboard' (it is significant that the parallel passage, *Iliad* XVI. 745, is spoken by an enemy), of Tenagon 'moving to and fro about the surf-beaten isle of Aias' (and if *πολεῖ* is corrupt *σποδεῖ* gives excellent sense), of Matallos 'soaking in death his thick bushy red beard,' of Tharybis, *εὐειδὴς ἀνὴρ*, lying dead, *οὐ μάλ' εὐτυχῶς*. If it is objected that this is nothing but the crude spirit of revenge, three things must be remembered. We are dealing with a national celebration; national feeling has always claimed greater freedom of speech than individual; and, above all, we have to reckon with the sublimation of emotion which art alone can achieve. A curious analogy is to be found in Moses' song of thanksgiving for the destruction of the Egyptians in the Red Sea. 'They sank to the bottom as a stone.' 'Thou sentest forth thy wrath which consumed them as stubble.' 'They sank as lead in the mighty waters.'

So 'pro-Greek' is the whole of the first part, and much of the rest, of the messenger's speech, that one is tempted to see in lines 326-8 a tribute to a gallant foe. It must have been a sense of the difference of tone which induced Dawes to read *δέ* for *τε*. Similarly one might be led into taking lines 374-383 as referring to the Greek sailors, but that would require further examination.

As additional instances of an appeal

to the audience, we may note the words *ἐρράχιζον* (426) and *κρεοκοποῦσι* (463), 'hack in pieces sma' (even *δυστήνων* is not against this interpretation, because it could convey the sense of 'wretches' to Athenian ears).

The next Chorus (532-597) is the veritable song of victory of the Greeks. Notice the opening words, *ὦ Ζεῦ βασιλεῦ*, which are exactly the words of the Chorus in the *Agamemnon* (355) celebrating the capture of Troy. Again, at 584-594 the dramatic fiction appears to be broken through and we seem to hear a Greek speaking.

*οὐκέτι περσονομούνται
οὐδ' ἐτι δασμοφοροῦσιν.*

Most editors have been forced to change *ἄρξονται* (589) into *ἄζονται*, so distinct is the impression of the other present tenses.

I pass over the introductory statement of Atossa and come to the invocation of Darius' ghost and the latter's strangely impressive pronouncements to Atossa and the Chorus (623-842). If the preceding part of the play is inspired by feelings of secular triumph, these feelings are now to be purified by a knowledge of the moral and religious principles involved, and deepened by a prediction of the victory of Plataea. The 'ironical' element is less prominent, as we might expect. But the warning *μέμνησθ'* Ἀθηναίων Ἑλλάδος τε could not but call up (as at 285 and 287) *δέσποτα μέμνεο τῶν Ἀθηναίων* (Herod. V. 105) or its equivalent, with a new and grim meaning; just like Atossa's *πικρὰν τιμωρίαν* (473), in which direct statement takes the place of allusion. The summary of Persian history (765-786), which would be quite out of place if intended for the information of the elders, is explained by the last two lines:

*ἅπαντες ἡμεῖς οἱ κράτη τὰδ' ἔσχομεν
οὐκ ἂν φανείμεν πῆματ' ἔρξαντες τόσα.*

It brings home to the Athenians the full extent of their victory. Darius' farewell to the Chorus is a puzzle. Its mysteriousness seems to be intentional. But, as so much has been said of the *πλούτος* of the Persians, we should perhaps once more take the Athenian standpoint and recognise a touch of sarcasm. The old men, who, as Persians, had lived for *πλούτος*, are to make the

most of what *πλούτος* remains, because *πλούτος* is no benefit to the dead.

Atossa in a few lines (845-851) expresses her anxiety chiefly about the state of her son's clothing, and departs to try to be ready to meet him with a new robe. There is no denying the reality of Atossa as a queen and the mother of Xerxes, but here again we are being led up to the final scene.

Then the Chorus recalls the greatness of Darius and his many conquests. The familiar names of Greek towns and islands which Athenian enterprise had won, or was winning, back—all find a place. And the *raison d'être* of this enumeration is given in lines 904-906. The Persians have been robbed of them by the defeat at Salamis.

The note of triumph rises again with the entry of Xerxes. Jacobs, as Hermann says, was right when he described the *Persae* as something like a cantata. We hear in the anapaests which recur among other metres an echo of the bolder anapaests of the opening chorus:

ποῦ δέ σοι παραστάται,
οἷος ἦν Φαρανδάκης,
Ζούσας, Πελάγων,
Δοτάμας, ἡδ' Ἀγδαβάτας, Ψάμμιν,
Ζουσισκάνης τ'.

And the answer is:

ἐρποντας ἐπ' ἀκταῖς
Σαλαμινιάσι στυφελοῦ
θείνοντας ἐπ' ἀκταῖς.

It is strange that Teuffel and Wecklein should have maintained that Xerxes did not appear on the stage in rags, in spite of the clear meaning of the line—

ὄρετ' τὸ λοιπὸν τότε τὰς ἐμὰς στολὰς;

It comes of taking too much to heart the criticism in Aristophanes' *Frogs*. But there is nothing in common between the Euripidean practice of putting ragged kings on the stage to excite pity and the final humiliation of Xerxes. Besides, there would be something incongruous about the defeated monarch

if he wore a new robe but retained for equipment only an empty quiver.

Two external considerations may serve to confirm the interpretation offered. In the *Frogs* Aeschylus is made to say:

εἶτα διδάξας Πέρσας μετὰ τοῦτ' ἐπιθυμεῖν ἐξεδίδαξα
(sc. τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις)
μικὰν ἀεὶ τοὺς ἀντιπάλους, κοσμήσας ἔργον ἀριστον.

If we may not take these as the sentiments of Aeschylus, then they are very likely the sentiments of Aristophanes, who was a good judge in all that pertained to patriotism. It is not the mood of men who have wept at the tragedy of the Persians. 'Il était beau,' Patin says, 'de voir ce peuple célébrer sa gloire en pleurant sur les vaincus.' On the other hand, Blomfield appears to have been misled by the *ἐχάρην* of Dionysus, especially as it is associated with the *ἱανοί* of the Persian Chorus. But that jolly divinity has been indulging in a good deal of irrelevant fooling, and must not be taken as typical of the average Athenian during a tragic festival. The best commentary on the whole matter is the words of Xerxes, *λυπρὰ, χάρματα δ' ἐχθροῖς*, and the sense of *χάρματα* has, I hope, been made clear. Finally, there is the argument from our conception of Aeschylus himself. His epitaph claims our remembrance on the one ground that he had proved his manhood on the field of battle, smiting the Mede. If a doubt is thrown on the genuineness of the epitaph, we have only to remember Cynaegirus and Aminias.

The subject of the *Persae* can best be described to English minds in the words of that other song to which reference has already been made: 'Pharaoh's chariots and his host hath he cast into the sea; his chosen captains also are drowned in the Red Sea.'

J. D. CRAIG.

Sheffield.

THE KERKIDAS PAPYRUS.

I.

MY excuse for these notes is that H(unt) left the papyrus of K(erkidas) in a wholly fragmentary state, and that since then no one has seen it. By 'wholly fragmentary' I mean that there

was no certain clue as to its length, or, more important, as to the length of individual poems. Perversely you might have judged that K. left three hymns of about four hundred lines each. The only clue lies in the small fragments,

and a long examination of them has yielded fruit in other directions, and by luck in this. H.'s speculations on p. 23 (*P. Oxy.* VIII.) are decisively disproved. He had, of course, little time to spare; and it is only *verbi causa* that I disagree with his remark, 'the remaining fragments (after 5 and 7) call for little notice.' As fragments they do not; but some are really thrilling, the most thrilling being one that reads *λει* (60).

Perhaps I had best begin by my conclusions. A very simple guess of mine, that *fr.* 23 came at the bottom of H.'s poem I., *fr.* 1, column i., led Mr. L(amacraft)—whose patient, forbearing, and wonderfully expert assistance I cannot too warmly acknowledge—to see that part of the papyrus had been folded over, a constellation of worm-holes occurring at nearly regular intervals. My second guess, founded again on pure literary conjecture, that *fr.* 60 belonged both to *fr.* 1, col. v., and to *fr.* 3, col. i., equated these columns. The circumference of the roll is small, and the first poem must have been outside. From this we get two results at once. First, part of the papyrus was rolled, and exact placing without contact is possible. Secondly, we have a whole hymn of about thirty-eight lines, or about fifty verses. Now, as we shall see, the early columns seem part of a hymn to Zeus, and if this came first, and was not out of proportion, few columns at the beginning are wholly lost.

The discussion of facts is more im-

portant than plausible spinning of hypotheses; and I shall proceed to give the rest of my conclusions on this matter in tabular form, with a new notation of columns. But first I must consider an objection. There are nine 'previously known fragments,' of which H. and W(ilamowitz) detect only two; and the short roll which I suggest appears inconsistent with probability. Against this, previously known *frs.* 1 and 7 (see my *First Greek Anthologist*, *passim*) are choliambic, and 5 may be so. So too may 6 (*μηδὲν μὲν ἐσθλὲν τῶν ἀνδρῶν προσηκόντων . . . εἰ παρῆιδον ἢ ἄκανθαν*), though it is equally well represented by a conjunction of papyrus *frs.* 30 and 25, which L. considers probable, and previously known *fr.* 4—in which, for metre's sake, we must indicate a lacuna after *ἐστακύναν*—may then, as well as not, coincide with the closing lines of papyrus *fr.* 3, col. iii. This leaves us only with the well-known fragment on the death of Diogenes and the one word *μαγίς* (=table), which may well have come in the fragmentary column, where I put the *φάσσα* and the *ἄκανθα*. And it must be remembered that in my scheme there are almost as many lines blank as not blank; and we should only expect to find, as we do, about half of the meliambic citations. Here, then, is the scheme. Metre A is the metre detected by M(aas); B is the metre of *fr.* 3. The fragments starred are nine fragments now in the British Museum not included in H.'s recension.

Poems (K.).	Columns (K.).	Columns (H.).	Metre.	Fragments.	'Previously known fragments.'	Approximate number of lines.	Subject.
I.	1	—	A/B	9*?	5?	120	Εἰς Δία (and perhaps τοὺς Θεούς).
	2	—	"	8, 10, 18, 20, 22, 67	—	—	
	3	<i>Fr.</i> 1 i.	"	8, 9, 23, 32	—	—	
IA.	4	<i>Fr.</i> 1 ii.	A	66	—	—	Εἰς Ἑρῶτα.
	5	<i>Fr.</i> 1 iii.	"	—	9	—	
II.	6	<i>Fr.</i> 1 iv.	"	—	—	41	Εἰς Ἑαυρόν.
	7	<i>Fr.</i> 1 v., 3 i.	"	7, 12, 13+53	3	—	
III.	8	<i>Fr.</i> 3 ii.	B	—	—	66	Εἰς τοὺς Μουσικοὺς.
	9	<i>Fr.</i> 3 iii.	B	59+11+39?	4	—	
	10	<i>Fr.</i> 2 i.	B	41+8*, 40?	6?	—	
IV.	11	<i>Fr.</i> 2 ii.	A	14, 37?	—	41	Εἰς τοὺς Στωικοὺς.
	12	<i>Fr.</i> 2 iii.	A	—	—	—	
V.	13	—	A	5+6	—	45	
	14	<i>Fr.</i> 4.	A	—	—	—	

Poem I. may, however, be two poems, the metre of the first being uncertain. The exact length of the last poem is uncertain, but I see no reason to suppose that all fragments cannot come in this scheme. It may even prove possible to scrap one column by equating 9 and 10, and to reduce the length of poem III. For this unrolled portion there is no safe guide. We can now examine the columns singly.

Column 2. The verses read :

.....]εγαροξευσεῖδέμεν
]νετοι[μ]αδεπειλαπι
]αιρωι[...β]λέννοτειου
]ασαλ[λα...]υσωκαιδο
]νυν[...α...]τωι[...
]ρτονλαμβα[...]

(Then as H.'s *fr.* 10.)

v. II :

.....]εσυμ[μικ]ηνα'καιτ[...]
]μιζ[ευσφ]υτευση[...]
]μ[ονον]αρ μοι το[...]
]ατα[...παλαιοσ[...]
]ινο[...]τεων. ὦ[...]
]των αντ[...ναλαβου[...]
]Ζευσκοιραν[...]
 .]ο... ορειν παρεστινε[ργον (continuing κᾶ[λον])

In v. 3 I read the 'drivelling—Teian —...', and refer to Anacreon. Possibly the mark under *ενο* is meant to show that the word runs over into the next verse. The supplements below are merely intended to indicate the size of gap. The number of letters missing at the end of each line is here and throughout uncertain. I would welcome any restoration that would help to fit in any extra fragments. In v. 12 *φυτεύς* I would suggest may be a noun. The precise placing of 20 and 22 is due to L. The top two lines suit metre B better than metre A. In my column 3 the fragments, though placed, yield for the most part little owing to their distance apart. In *fr.* 9 neither H.'s *χον συγηροί* nor my *χουσι γήρα* will scan in metre A. Here again we must suspect corruption or metre B. In *fr.* 32 (exactly placed by L.) *α]βριδια* *τριβα* [is demanded by metre—H. read *εριδια*. At a gap of one verse we get

(*fr.* 23) *εισ[ο]κ αυτων [ανερ ο]λβοθυλακον λαρον τε και ακρασιωνα* (col. iv.).

Of col. iv. I need say little. In line 3 (H., *fr.* 1, p. 29) I intend to read *εις ανονατ' α[πορ]ρεοντα*; the scholium at the top must surely be *ακρατῆς [και κατα]γνωστός τις και μιάρος*. M. has given me a better reading of the scholium on 16, *ζῶον ὁ τύπους μ(έν) ὀφθαλμ(ών) ἔχει, ὀφθαλμούς δὲ οὐ· οὐδ(ἐ) βλ[ε]πει*. In 17 my placing of *fr.* 66 refutes counter-suggestions to H.'s *ἀστεροπαγερέτας*, now certain. In cols. iv.-v. I should read *τὸ τάλαντον . . . μέσσον τὸν Ὀλυμπον [ἀνὰ τὸ] ὄρθον [ισχεικ]αί*, but print, for the sake of metre, *μέσσον τ' ἀν' Ὀ. ἀνίσχει*, deleting *ἀνὰ τὸ ὄρθον*. In col. v., lines 7-8, I should explain the second *δέ* as resumptive, or, if you like, pleonastic, and explain, 'while as to Brygians (*i.e.* Macedonians), who live God knows where, as to them I fear to say how much they pull down (*κατάγει*, Eur. *Bacch.* 1065) on their side (*τὸ παρ' αὐτοῖς*) the scale of Zeus.' In col. vi., line 10, H. shows more letters missing after *εὐμενέ[* than is probable. I fancy there were none after *βροτῶν* or this; read *καὶ βροτῶν <ὄτφ> γὰρ ἂν πραεῖα μὲν καὶ εὐμενεδεξιτέρα* by a simple transference of the *μὲν*, which appears in the papyrus with *γάρ* as a correction above it. In line 12 H. is tempted, despite grammatical scruples, to translate *ναῦν τὰν ἔρωτος*, 'the ship of love,' rather than *ἐν ἀτρεμίᾳ ἔρωτος*, 'in calmness of love,' forgetting that the Greeks could say (*e.g.*) *νηνεμίαν ἀνέμων* (Plat. *Symph.* 197c), and that love is always an element, never a ship: Meleag. *A.P.* V. 156, *ἀφιλέως χαροποῖς Ἀσκληπιάς οἷα Γαλήνης ὄμμασι συμπίθει πάντας ἔρωτο-πλοεῖν*.

In col. vii., *frs.* 13 and 53 were placed by my suggestion. An examination of the back enabled L. to fix them about six letters from the beginning of the column, but the position vertically is not yet ascertained: immediate contact with what follows would give the strange *-στᾶρπ[α]φια. τιπλοος*, of which I can make nothing—*ἀστροπαφρικτό-πλοος* is quite impossible. Perhaps the fragment comes at the top of the page. Below, however, we are on surer ground. After considerable thought I decided that, like it or lump it, one must read

something like $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho \tau\acute{o} \beta\iota\alpha\iota \sim \sim \sim$
 $\kappa\alpha\iota \pi\rho\omicron\kappa\omicron\theta[\eta]\lambda\upsilon\mu\alpha\nu[\epsilon\varsigma \delta\iota\delta\omicron\iota \tau\iota] \nu\acute{\alpha} \beta\lambda\alpha\psi\iota\text{--}$
 $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota\alpha\nu \kappa\alpha\iota \mu[\epsilon\gamma\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\nu \delta'] \delta\upsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\nu$. You may
 rightly exclaim against certain weak-
 nesses in this; but you will be wrong
 if you exclaim against the metre of $\tau\iota\nu\acute{\alpha}$
 $\beta\lambda$. (Hermann, *Orph.* II., pp. 760-1) or
 against the compounds. For Kerkidas
 was even more daring, as you will see if
 you insert *fr.* 12, for we get $\beta\iota\alpha\iota[\sigma\omicron\pi\acute{o}\nu]\eta\text{--}$
 $\rho\omicron\nu$, $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\iota \tau'$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}$, and $\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha} \mu\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omicron\delta\upsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\nu$.
 As to these words, $\pi\rho\omicron\kappa\omicron\theta\eta\lambda$. is clearly
 'mad after the (fugitive) deer,' a response
 to the masterpiece of Callimachus (*Ep.*
 33): ' $\Omega\gamma\rho\epsilon\upsilon\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$, $\text{'}\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}\kappa\nu\delta\epsilon\varsigma$, $\acute{\epsilon}\nu \omicron\upsilon\breve\rho\epsilon\varsigma\iota$
 $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha \lambda\alpha\gamma\omega\delta\acute{o}\nu \delta\iota\phi\acute{\alpha} \kappa\alpha\iota \pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\eta\varsigma \acute{\iota}\chi\nu\iota\alpha$
 $\delta\omicron\rho\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\varsigma . . . \chi\upsilon\acute{o}\mu\omicron\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega\varsigma \tau\omicron\iota\omicron\varsigma\delta\epsilon$.
 $\tau\acute{\alpha} \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \phi\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha \delta\iota\omega\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu \omicron\iota\delta\epsilon$, $\tau\acute{\alpha} \delta' \acute{\epsilon}\nu$
 $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\phi \kappa\acute{\epsilon}\iota\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha \pi\alpha\rho\pi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\alpha\tau\alpha\iota$. For $\mu\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omicron\text{--}$
 $\delta\upsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\nu$ we can put up a weak defence
 with $\mu\epsilon\lambda\lambda\acute{\iota}\epsilon\rho\eta$ and $\mu\epsilon\lambda\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\phi\eta\beta\omicron\varsigma$: but
 $\beta\lambda\alpha\psi\iota\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota\alpha\nu$! Yet you can read every
 letter of it, for *fr.* 60 exactly fits.
 $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\upsilon\sigma\iota\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota\alpha$ and $\lambda\upsilon\sigma\iota\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota\alpha$ provide the
 only excuses. The idea is better than
 the words: 'for lust that is violent and
 base, mad as hound after deer in the
 chase, speeds swift o'er the profitless
 moor, full cry after anguish in store.'
 I have to thank Mr. Milne as well as
 L. for much time spent in verifying
 the place of the fragments in this
 column.

But this placing gives us more than a
 handful of new words for the lexica. It
 is almost as certain as could be that
 the wormhole in *fr.* 63 is the 'opposite
 number' of a wormhole in *fr.* 3, cols.
 i.-ii., and that col. ii. must be taken as
 the next column. I owe this point to
 L., as, though I placed the columns to-
 gether, I did not observe this proof.
 As *fr.* 3 is in an entirely different metre,
 the poem (Hunt's II.) has to end in
fr. 1, col. v. (H.) H. did not record
 the beginnings of three lines, 18, 19,
 and 20 (so they should be numbered),
 $/\gamma\alpha/\gamma\alpha/\rho\epsilon/$. Myscheme thus runs things
 rather fine, though there is room for a
 coronis below the last two letters, the
 margin being absent. Having my solu-
 tion ready, I asked L. to fit in *fr.* 7, and,

working from the back, he placed it
 where I hoped, so that you get:

$\delta\alpha\rho\epsilon\iota\omicron\delta\omicron\kappa\epsilon\iota\gamma\alpha\mu\beta\rho\epsilon\sigma[$
 $\tau\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\nu \cdot \nu\upsilon[\dots \dots] \tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\rho[$
 $\gamma\alpha[\dots \dots] \epsilon\nu\epsilon\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\sigma[$
 $\gamma\alpha[\dots \dots] \kappa\alpha\iota \phi\iota\lambda\omicron\sigma[$
 $\rho\epsilon[\dots] \text{nil}$
 $[$

And there the column ends. As at the
 end of (Hunt's) poem I. the writer
 stops in the middle of the column for a
 new poem.

Stobaeus in his anthology (*Fl.* LVIII.
 10, $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota \acute{\eta}\sigma\upsilon\chi\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$!) gives (according to
 his MSS.) these verses as $\acute{o} \tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \acute{\rho}\iota\kappa\nu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$
 $\chi\epsilon\lambda\omega\nu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\mu\nu\acute{\alpha}\mu\omicron\nu\alpha \omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho \acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$
 $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha} \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota \phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$. Following pre-
 vious correctors, none of whom suc-
 ceeded in restoring the exact metre, I
 would read, $[\nu\upsilon\nu] \kappa\omega \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega \cdot \tau\acute{o} \tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \acute{\rho}\iota\kappa\nu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$
 $<\nu\upsilon\nu> \gamma\alpha\chi\epsilon\lambda\omega\nu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \mu\nu\alpha\mu\acute{o}\nu\epsilon\upsilon \cdot \omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$
 $\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\theta\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota \phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\omicron\varsigma \pi\acute{\alpha}\rho\epsilon\sigma\tau' \acute{\alpha}\epsilon\iota$.
 $\gamma\alpha\chi$. would be land-turtle) ($\pi\omicron\upsilon\tau\iota\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \chi$.:
 Crates, *fr.* 29. As to the point, the
 poem, after rejecting a violent passion
 after a hopeless quarry, recommends
 the love of the market-place: oddly
 enough, too, since Diogenes was not
 famous for that form of quietude. We
 now get the true climax, which means,
 roughly, 'love, like charity, begins at
 home.' Unpleasant details you can of
 course find in Diog. L. VI. 46, Diog.
Ep. 35, and, I fear, in many other
 writers.

One point remains. At the end of
 line 18 (H.)—really I fancy 17—you
 get $\gamma\alpha\mu\beta\rho\epsilon\sigma . . \tau' \acute{\eta}\mu\epsilon\nu$. This shows
 that H. was wrong in emending to
 $\gamma\alpha\mu\beta\rho\omicron\varsigma \tau\acute{o}\kappa' \acute{\eta}\mu\epsilon\nu$. $\gamma\alpha\mu\beta\rho\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\alpha$ can
 be defended as well as some preceding
 words by (a) such phrases as $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\chi\iota\sigma\tau\alpha$
 $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\nu\alpha\iota \tau\tilde{\phi} \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota$, despite the existence of
 $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\chi\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$; (b) such words as $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\text{--}$
 $\tau\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$; (c) the fact that $-\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ is good
 (Sicilian) Doric for $-\acute{o}\tau\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$. $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\gamma\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\epsilon\text{--}$
 $\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ (Epich. *fr.* 186 Kb.) presumably
 suggested this monstrosity, unless the
 whole word is lifted from Epicharmus.

A. D. KNOX.

THE HISTORICAL IMPORTANCE OF CULT-ASSOCIATIONS.

THE cult-association is primarily a family. Its head is called 'pater,' not merely by worshippers of Mithras, but also by devotees of Cybele,¹ the Syrian Belela,² and the Theos Hypsistos in the Bosphorus.³ So a prominent benefactress of the dendrophori is given the title *μήτηρ*.⁴ The members of these sodalities are brothers: worshippers of Juppiter Dolichenus are called 'fratres carissimi,'⁵ and the term 'fratres' is used to designate members of societies formed to honour Juppiter Beeldefarus, Mithras, and Bellona.⁶ The Bosphoran inscriptions speak of *εἰσποιητοὶ ἀδελφοὶ σεβόμενοι θεὸν ὑψίστον*:⁷ this phrase is important, since adoption constituted in antiquity as close a tie as blood-relationship. Side by side with it we find as an equivalent *τὸν ἴδιον ἀδελφόν*.⁸ Further, the body as a whole could be called a *cognatio*,⁹ and 'pius in collegio' occurs exactly as 'pius in suos'.¹⁰

This conception was made more real by the possession of a common place of burial. This is frequently attested for Roman 'cultores,'¹¹ but is less common for Greek associations: for them we have the evidence of a quotation from Solon in the Digest¹² and of some inscriptions,¹³ one of which reveals the important fact that adherents of Orphism in Cumae had a common burial-place as early as the fifth century B.C.¹⁴ The parallelism with a family is very clear when the society's mausoleum is inscribed with minute regulations defining who may and who may not be buried within, just as they

appear continually on family tombs with an *ἄλλω δὲ μηδενὶ ἐξέστω*. A good example of such a mausoleum has been found at Adanda in Anatolia.¹⁵

The cult-association, then, is a family and feels itself such. Its great importance in history is that it provided an opportunity for the evolution of new religious ideas. The history of Gnosticism is the history of a number of small associations developing on similar but divergent lines and assimilating freely external beliefs. The spread of a diluted Judaism in the Greek cities of South Russia¹⁶ and elsewhere¹⁷ was largely due to similar societies.

These instances are familiar. We shall find further confirmation of their evidence if we turn to Dionysiac societies, the most numerous of all such organisations.¹⁸ Here there was a freedom of development absent from the inelastic official cult of the god. A recent papyrus find gives us an edict issued by Ptolemaeus IV. Philopator for the regulation of private worship of Dionysus.¹⁹ All who performed such private rites were to sail to Alexandria within a fixed period (longer for those who lived above Naucratis), and register themselves and give the history of their rites for three generations back. Further, they were to give up their *ἱεροὶ λόγοι*²⁰ under a seal. This attempt at a regulation of religious development shows that such development existed in private side by side with the public worship with its elaborate processions.²¹

¹ C.I.L. XIV. 70.

² Ditt.³, I 1111¹⁵.

³ *παῖρ συνόδου*, Minns, *Scythians and Greeks*, p. 655, *inscr.* 534.

⁴ IG Rom. I. 604.

⁵ Dess. 4316; cf. 4296.

⁶ References are given by De Ruggiero, *Diz. Ep.* III. 216.

⁷ Minns, *Scythians and Greeks*, p. 656, *inscr.* 585; cf. p. 521⁹⁰.

⁸ Minns, *op. cit.*, p. 624.

⁹ Waltzing, *Corp. Rom.* III., n. 296.

¹⁰ Waltzing, *Diz. Ep.* II., p. 367.

¹¹ Waltzing, *Corp. Rom.* IV., p. 484.

¹² XLVII. 22. 4.

¹³ As Ditt.³, I 1117-1120; cf. M.N. Tod., *B.S.A.* XIII. 336, Poland, *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens*, p. 503.

¹⁴ D. Comparetti, *Ausonia*, I. 14.

¹⁵ Published by Paribeni and Romanelli, *Mon. Antichi* XXIII. (1914), n. 113, p. 160.

¹⁶ Schürer, *Sitz. ber. Berlin*, 1897, p. 200—, summarised by Minns, *op. cit.*, p. 621.

¹⁷ Cumont, *Comptes Rendus Acad. Inscr.*, 1906, 63—.

¹⁸ Poland, *op. cit.*, p. 196.

¹⁹ Schubart, *Ämtliche Berichte aus den Königlich-kunstsammlungen*, XXXVIII. (1916-7), p. 189—; *Einführung in die Papyruskunde*, p. 352.

²⁰ For these cf. O. Kern, *Orphica*, p. 143, and, to give a magical example, *P. Parthey* I. 64 (where for *ἱερῶν* read *ἱερὸν*; *φῶλον* is corrupted to *φῶλον*, l. 88).

²¹ Such as that described by Callixenus Rhodius *ap. Athenae*. 196 A.

Fortunately a more recent papyrus publication has thrown light on the character of this private cult. A fragmentary Orphic liturgy, slightly earlier than the royal edict, has been found.¹ From it we learn that the movement had proceeded among Greeks in Egypt much as it had elsewhere: the fragments have various points of contact with the famous South Italian tablets, which can be paralleled from Crete,² and with the later Orphic hymns, which were almost undoubtedly the hymn-book of a small Orphic community in Asia Minor.³ The development had been free but parallel.

The importance of the Ptolemaic edict is increased by the fact that its provisions agree closely with those of the *Senatus consultum de Bacchanalibus*. It is a brilliant conjecture that Aemilius Lepidus, who had been consul in the previous year and was an influential member of the college of pontifices,⁴ had learnt of the Egyptian regulations when he was in that country as an envoy.⁵

At the time of the *Senatus consultum* there was clearly no law limiting the freedom of religious association.⁶ All associations were dissolved by the *Senatus consultum* of 64 B.C., all restored by Clodius in 58. Caesar's radical action spared none which could not claim antiquity.⁷ The question was finally settled by a *lex Iulia* of Augustus.⁸ Of particular significance is the fact that frequency of meeting was limited: *collegia tenuiorum*, which were given a fair degree of freedom in general, might meet only once a month.⁹ All religious societies were under strict surveillance: the authorities feared

treasonable plots carried on 'sub praetextu religionis'.¹⁰

Such bodies were often indebted to some rich member for their place of common worship: this was the case with the Artemisioi of Naples,¹¹ for instance. I should like to suggest that the now famous underground basilica, discovered in 1917 near the Porta Maggiore at Rome, was the place where met for worship a small sodality, thus provided with a chapel by a Statilius¹² who was a member and liberally disposed. Cumont, for all his learning and ingenuity, has really failed to make a substantial case for supposing the rites there performed to have been Neopythagorean:¹³ a building which in its structure and in the arrangement of its floor-mosaics contradicts every principle of symmetry would have been ill-suited to such a purpose.

Rude workmanship¹⁴ and the desire for concealment may have combined to produce this result. The desire for concealment is quite comprehensible in view of the jealous supervision exercised by the Imperial régime over religious guilds, and the attempt to worship thus in private would certainly have given plausibility to the charges brought against Statilius Taurus in A.D. 53, at the instigation of Agrippina, who desired his gardens. These related chiefly to *magicas superstitiones*, says Tacitus.¹⁵ As the decoration of the Basilica is not later than the first century of our era,¹⁶ and it stands in the gardens of the Statilii and is constructed underground, it is a plausible conjecture of Fornari's¹⁷ that the building and the rites carried

¹⁰ Ulpian in *Dig.* XLVII., 11. 2; Kornemann, *loc. cit.*, p. 411.

¹¹ D. Mallardo, *Memorie Napoli* II. ii., p. 149, published with commentary by A. Maiuri, *Studi Romani* I., p. 21.

¹² The Basilica is in the gardens of the Statilii, (Fornari, *Notizie degli Scavi*, 1918, p. 51). Lanciani has disputed this identification (*Bullettino Comunale*, XLVI., p. 69) on grounds which I am not fully competent to weigh. I have the high authority of Dr. Ashby in favour of accepting it.

¹³ As he has argued, *Rev. Arch.*, VIII. (1918), pp. 52-73.

¹⁴ Like that of the Ostian Mithraeum.

¹⁵ *Ann.* XII. 59.

¹⁶ This dating is universally accepted.

¹⁷ *Loc. cit.*

¹ *P. Gurob I.* Well discussed by M. Tiernay, *Class. Quart.*, 1922, p. 77, and reproduced, with notes, by O. Kern, *Orphica*, n. 31, p. 101.

² Kern, *op. cit.*, p. 105.

³ Dieterich, *Kleine Schriften*, p. 86—; Kern, *Genethiakon Robert*, p. 89—.

⁴ Cf. Münzer, *Römische Adelsparteien und Adelsfamilien*, p. 201.

⁵ Cichorius, *Römische Studien* (1922), p. 22—.

⁶ So Kornemann, *P.W.* IV., p. 405.

⁷ *Suet. Jul.* 42. The Jews were privileged. Cf. *P.W.* IV. 408.

⁸ For which cf. Waltzing, *Diz. Ep.* II., p. 352.

⁹ Kornemann, *loc. cit.*, p. 410.

on within¹ were the substantial basis of the accusation. *Magicas superstitiones* could quite well refer to such private worship: magic in antiquity was essentially private and in some antithesis to the official worship of the community. 'Ideo magi estis quia nouum nescio quod genus religionis inducitis' are the words put in the mouth of a Roman magistrate cross-examining the Christian Achatius.² Further, Orpheus, the supposed author of the belief and ritual of so many societies, was commonly regarded as the founder of magic,³ and the Orphic hymns contain elements which can fairly be called magical.⁴

What the purpose of the chapel was⁵ cannot be determined with certainty till the stuccos are all satisfactorily interpreted. Meanwhile, I would urge, as Leopold⁶ has urged, that the rites were Orphic in character. I use the word Orphic in a wide sense; by the first century of our era Orphic, Dionysiac, and Eleusinian had long been indistinguishable terms. When

Dionysus was identified with Iakchos⁷ the decisive step was taken. Afterwards we find him enjoying worship jointly with Demeter,⁸ and Kore had her part in the ritual of the Iobakchoi.⁹

With this view of the chapel's purpose the scene in the apse agrees excellently. It appears to represent in vivid antithesis the fate of the initiate and that of the uninitiated.¹⁰ This sharp contrast was essential to Orphism, as we know it early from Plato:¹¹ it is reproduced in art, as on a fine Ephesian sarcophagus of the Antonine age¹² and on a Roman sarcophagus known to us only from the drawing in Codex Pighianus fol. 269.¹³ Certainly Dionysiac are the repeated *oscilla*¹⁴ on the walls of the Basilica and the Maenad riding on the panther, and the winged Victories¹⁵ would be perfectly appropriate. The sacred trees within enclosures and the pillars associated with them, which form the lowest band of decoration, are quite consistent with the rest: they can be paralleled from a Pompeian wall-painting showing an act of worship before such a tree and column, and clearly characterised as Dionysiac by a cantharus, thyrsololochi and the like.¹⁶ Definite tree-worship in

¹ Or intended to be carried on, if the building was never actually used.

² *Acta disputationis S. Achatii*, p. 119, 31, Gebh.

³ Cf. passages quoted by Gruppe, *Roscher*, III. 1103.

⁴ Gruppe, *loc. cit.*, 1050. Cf. his connexion with alchemy (Kern, *Orphica*, p. 332).

⁵ Fornari suggests an Oriental or mystic cult, comparing the urn showing Heracles' initiation found in the tomb of the Statilii (now in Museo delle Terme). He is mistaken in arguing from the cognomen *Mystes*, borne by a freedman of the Statilii (*C.I.L.* VI. 6632) and his son; it was an ordinary Greek name (cf. *Pape-Benseler*, s.v.), used by Roman freedmen (De Vit, *Onomasticon*, s.v.).

Bagnani is quite unjustified in saying that 'remains of the inaugural sacrifice show that the building was dedicated to the infernal deities' (*J.R.S.* IX., p. 82), and referring to Fornari (*loc. cit.*, p. 47) as supporting his statement. Fornari correctly explained the remains in question as pointing to a preliminary sacrifice in propitiation of chthonic powers which had to be performed before the Basilica could be used for its proper purpose. Hubaux' suggestion (*Musée Belge*, 1923, p. 59—) that the Basilica was devoted to the worship of Cotytto is unreasonable; in Roman literature she is but a literary allusion.

⁶ *Mélanges Rome* XXXIX., p. 165—. This brilliant article did not come into my hands till this article was substantially completed.

⁷ Cf. Kern in *P.W.*, s.v. Iakchos. They are distinguished by Artemidorus (cf. *Oneirocritica* II. 37, p. 140. 25 Hercher, and II. 38, p. 144. 25).

⁸ *Br. Mus.* III., 595. 22.

⁹ *Ditt.* 1109¹²⁴.

¹⁰ I certainly prefer this view, which is that of Mrs. Strong, to Curtis', *A.J.A.*, 1920, p. 144, supported by J. Hubaux, *Musée Belge*, 1923, p. 13.

¹¹ As *Rep.* 363 C, *Phaedo* 69 C.

¹² Published by J. Keil, *Jahreshefte* XVII. (1914), p. 133—. This is possibly the meaning of the contrasted figures on the obscure Torre Nova sarcophagus, *Röm. Mitth.* 1910, p. 89—, and probably that of the groups at the mutilated end of the relief on the grave of the Rhodian schoolmaster Hieronymus, figured and discussed by Hiller von Gärtringen and Robert, *Hermes* XXXVII. (1902), p. 122— (cf. esp. p. 134).

¹³ Discussed by O. Jahn, *Sächs. Ber.*, 1856, p. 275— (*Darstellungen der Unterwelt auf römischen Sarcophagen*, and figured *Taf.* III. D.). Here the Danaids (cf. Plato *Gorg.* 493 B., Pausanias, x. 31. 9, etc.) are contrasted with a Bacchic thiasos of the blessed, including Heracles (himself *μύρτης*, cf. Lycophron, *Alex.* 1328, and Jahn, *l.c.*, p. 278).

¹⁴ Cf. J. A. Hild, *Dar. S.*, IV., p. 257—.

¹⁵ Reinach, *Rép. Rel.*, III., p. 183.

¹⁶ Helbig, *Wandgemälde*, n. 572; Reinach, *Rép. Peint.*, p. 117.

connexion with the cult of Dionysus is attested by Pausanias.¹

Moreover, it is Dionysiac symbolism that was normally used to express a belief in personal immortality. Sarcophagi were constantly decorated with masks, clusters of grapes, and Bacchants,² the infancy of the god,³ and the like. In many cases these are probably no more than mere ornament, devoid of any symbolical meaning: to take an earlier Greek example, we should probably attach no importance to the Bacchic terra-cottas found in a tomb at Great Blisnizta,⁴ or to the representation of a row of Bacchants in the same tomb.⁵ This is what we must always expect of symbols: the ravishing of Ganymede is certainly on many sepulchral monuments a symbol of the soul's immortality,⁶ but it is at the same time employed as a purely decorative motif.⁷

Nevertheless, there is evidence to show that this Dionysiac imagery enshrined originally a belief in the soul's immortality. There is in the Museo delle Terme the sarcophagus of a pious Jew,⁸ whose religious scruples compelled him to substitute a seven-branched candlestick⁹ for the usual portrait in a medallion. Under it is a representation of Dionysiac *βούκολοι*: its *raison d'être* seems to be that the man who had the sarcophagus constructed wished to express his faith in the future life in a manner intelligible to his contemporaries.¹⁰

¹ II. 2. 7.

² Altmann, *Die römischen Grabaltäre der Kaiserzeit*, p. 267; Macchioro, *Memorie Napoli*, I., p. 84.

³ As the sarcophagi figured by Rizzo, *Memorie Napoli*, III., p. 43, Fig. 3; p. 44, Fig. 5.

⁴ Stephani, *C.R.*, *Petersburg*, 1869, Pl. II. III.

⁵ Stephani, *l.c.*, Pl. I., 7, 8, 9.

⁶ As in the examples quoted by Cumont, *Études Syriennes*, p. 861.

⁷ As in painting, cf. Reinach, *Rép. Peint.*, p. 14.

⁸ No. 373 in Pariben's catalogue.

⁹ For which cf. Lebas-Waddington, *Inscr. Asie Mineure*, 1854 c.; Ramsay, *C.B.* II., p. 652; Minns, *op. cit.*, p. 622; *Notizie*, 1921, p. 359.

¹⁰ So Cumont has well set forth, *Rev. Arch.*, 1916, IV., p. 1. The Dionysiac associations of the next world are illustrated by such phraseology as *Orph. Hymn*, I. 3: (Ἑκάτην) ψυχὰς νεκρῶν μεταβαλεῖν οὖσαν. On the other hand, the

Now the stuccos in the Basilica are certainly concerned to a large extent with the soul's immortality. The Victories with crowns,¹¹ the rape of Ganymede, the rape of the Leucippides,¹² are all appropriate. If the other stuccos when fully interpreted prove to be concerned with themes of a non-Dionysiac character,¹³ this will not in itself invalidate the case for the view that the Basilica was intended for Dionysiac worship. By the first century of our era Orphism had incorporated in itself much that belonged properly to other cults, as those of the Cabiri and Sabazius:¹⁴ this is borne out by the Orphic hymns.¹⁵

I should add that there is no sub-

apotheosis of the dead man as Dionysus (briefly discussed by Farnell, *Greek Hero Cults*, p. 395: cf. Stat. *Silvae*, II. 7, 124) is, I think, different: it is not a sort of extension to private individuals of the apotheosis of living kings as *νέοι Διόνυσοι*? In the same way the use of the eagle on sarcophagi was extended from royalty to commoners (cf. Cumont, *Ét. Syr.*, p. 85).

¹¹ Victories as a symbol of immortality continued in use on Christian sarcophagi, as Kaufmann, *Handb. chr. Arch.*, p. 259, *abb.* 119, p. 293, *abb.* 144. The crown is due to the idea of life as an *αἰών* (see for this, *Hermes ap. Stob.* i. 49-49, p. 417, 18 W.; cf. p. 274. 17; Kroll, *de Orac. Chald.*, p. 52); so one of a series of iambic precepts inscribed on a column near a sarcophagus at Olympus, in Lycia, runs thus:

πολλοὺς ἀγῶνας διανύσας λήψῃ στέφος.
(Lebas, 1339₁₀)

The crown naturally continued in use in Christian art (cf. Kaufmann³, p. 293) and language: the soul's crown is as much at home in *Mart. S. Polycarpi*, ch. 17, p. 8, 28 Gebh., Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* V. 1, *C.I.L.* VIII. 17386, as in *Vettius Valens*, VI. 2, p. 248, 28 ed. Kroll [*Lebas*, 2405, is probably Christian (so Franz and Waddington, *ad loc.*)].

¹² Cf. Reinach, *Rép. Rel.*, III. 33, 228, 258, 379.

¹³ Thus the figures of Attis recognised by Cumont would be doubly relevant. On the one hand, they are connected in Imperial art with the notion of immortality (cf. Cumont, *T.M.*, II., p. 437—, 526; E. Strong, *J.R.S.*, I. 17). On the other hand, the identification of Demeter with Rhea, which is as old as the fifth century B.C. (O. Kern, *P.W.* IV. 2755), led ultimately to an identification of Dionysos with Attis in speculation (Cumont, *P.W.* II. 2250), and speculation was often based on cult: some fusion is attested by *Orph. Hymn* XLII.

¹⁴ Cf. M. Tiernay, *Class. Quart.*, 1922, 77, s.

¹⁵ They probably belong to this period (cf. Wünsch, *P.W.* IX. 171). Hauck's attempt (*Bresl. phil. Abh.*, 43) to date them in the late fifth century of our era is absurd.

stantial reason for regarding this basilica as a domestic chapel. Such domestic chapels other than *lararia* are not attested by our ancient evidence. Thus there is no reason to believe that the Mithraeum which Mercatorius Castrensis 'in suo constituit' at Osterbrucken¹ was intended for purely domestic worship, and in any case the phrase is unique among Mithraic inscriptions. Macchioro has argued² that the room in the Villa Item decorated with the famous Dionysiac pictures was a chapel: this is not proved, and, even if it is true, there is no reason to suppose that the chapel was anything but the chapel of a small sodality. A private cult of the Dioscuri occurred on the estate of Apollonius at Heptakomia,³ but the position of Egypt was unique, and a Greek settler, alone among foreigners, may well have founded such a private cult in the exceptional circumstances in which he found himself.

¹ Cumont, *T.M.* II, p. 154; *inscr.* 425.

² *Zagreus*, 1921, p. 60.

³ *Mitteis-Wilcken* I. ii, n. 94, p. 123.

There is then, I hope, a strong reason to believe that the Basilica was the chapel of a small and private religious association, probably of a Dionysiac character.⁴

Postscript.—For the appropriateness of a tree and a sacred column and cult-statue in Dionysiac imagery we may further compare the glass balsamarium of Torrita, now in the Museo Archeologico at Florence, described by L. A. Milani in his *Guide* (ed. 1923, pp. 209 f.), and figured by Lovatelli, *Memorie dei Lincei*, Sec. III, vol. xiii. (1884), pp. 591 ff. The plate faces p. 498. It represents a Bacchic initiation, and shows us an image on a column with a sacred tree beside it.

A. D. NOCK.

⁴ The above was written before Bendinelli's article (*Bulletino Comunale*, XLIX. 1922, p. 85—) came into my hands. Bendinelli maintains that the basilica was intended to be a mausoleum, which would be not inconsistent with the performance of sacrifices there (p. 121). He has urged this with skill and learning, but I cling to the view expressed above. I should wish, in closing, to express my thanks to Mrs. Strong for the help she kindly gave me when I was studying the basilica.

AESCHYLEA.

I. *Septem*, ll. 472 ff. (= 459 ff., Tucker).

The passage is a complete speech by Eteocles:

πέμπουμ' ἂν ἤδη τόνδε, σὺν τύχῃ δέ τῳ
καὶ δὴ πέπεμπται [οὐ] κόμπων ἐν χερσὶν ἔχων,
Μεγαρέυς, Κρέοντος σπέρμα τοῦ σπαρτῶν γένους,
475 ὅς οὔτι μάργων ἱππικῶν φρουαγμάτων
βρόμον φοβηθεὶς ἐκ πυλῶν χωρήσεται,
ἀλλ' ἢ θανάῳ τροφείᾳ πληρώσει χθονί,
ἢ καὶ δὴ ἄνδρε καὶ πόλισμ' ἐπ' ἀσπίδος
ἐλὼν λαφύροις δῶμα κοσμήσει πατρός.
480 κόμπας' ἐπ' ἄλλον, μῆδέ μοι φθόνοι λέγων.

Eteocles, the champion with whom Megareus is matched, bore on his shield the device of a hoplite climbing a scaling-ladder set against an enemy's tower: from the hoplite's mouth ran a written boast that 'not even Ares should cast him from the battlements.'

Ll. 465 ff.:

ἐσχημάτισται δ' ἀσπίς οὐ σμικρὸν τρόπον·
ἄνιρ δ' ὀπλίτης κλίμακος προσαμβάσει
στείχει πρὸς ἐχθρῶν πύργον ἐκπέρσαι θέλων·
βοᾷ δὲ χροῖος γραμμάτων ἐν ξυλλαβαῖς,
ὡς οὐδ' ἂν Ἀρης σφ' ἐκβάλαι πυργωμάτων.

Line 480 has jarred on many critics. The variants ἐπ' ἄλλον for ἐπ' ἄλλω

and λίαν for λέγων are found in MSS., and Valckenaer's λόγων is widely accepted (for instance, by Sidgwick and Wilamowitz). Blomfield suggested ἔτ' ἄλλον, Verrall ἔτ' ἄλλα.

There has, however, been (I think) little difference in opinion about the general sense of the line. Everyone supposes that Eteocles is telling the κατὰσκοπος to pass on to the next champion: 'Boast on with another, and stint me not your story' (Tucker): 'Dis-nous la jactance d'un autre et ne nous sois point avare de rapports' (Mazon). In this interpretation critics have doubtless been influenced by the close of Eteocles' preceding speech (l. 451):

λέγ' ἄλλον ἄλλαις ἐν πύλαις εἰληχότα.

But that is the only one of six similar speeches that ends with such a remark. Indeed, nowhere else in the play does Eteocles deign directly to address the κατὰσκοπος: and that line has a stern military aloofness quite unlike the familiarity of μῆδέ μοι φθόνοι λέγων.

Moreover, the received translation is strained and awkward: in Verrall's words, 'κομπάζειν ἐπὶ τινι would naturally mean "to boast or triumph over another," not "to describe him in high or boastful terms," which is the sense required.'

I believe that κόμπας' ἐπ' ἄλλῳ does here bear its natural sense, and that the text is sound, but wrongly punctuated. I suggest that ll. 465 ff. should be printed thus:

ἦ καὶ δὴ' ἄνδρε καὶ πόλισμ' ἐπ' ἀσπίδος
ἐλὼν λαφύροις δῶμα κομήσει πατρός
'Κόμπας' ἐπ' ἄλλῳ, μὴδ' ἐμοὶ φθόνει' λέγων.

The third line completes the jest of the first—the jest of treating the boastful mannikin blazoned on Eteoclus' shield as a real person. Megareus, the 'practical boaster,' κόμπων ἐν χερσὶν ἔχων, will hang the shield in his father's house, saying to the mannikin: 'Hang there and boast on! But you must boast over earlier antagonists, and you must let me boast over you!'

2. *Persae*, ll. 144 ff.:

πῶς δ' αὖ πράσσει Ξέρξης βασιλεὺς
Δαρείου γένος, τὸ πατρωνύμιον
γένος ἀμέτερον· πότερον τόξου
ῥῦμα τὸ νικῶν, ἢ δορυκράνον
λόγχης ισχύος κεράτηεν;

Mazon translates: 'Xerxès, fils de Darios, le roi de notre sang qui nous a fourni le nom de ses aïeux,' and adds the note, 'La nation perse doit son nom à Persée l'aïeul du Perséide Xerxès.' Wilamowitz's critical note is a sufficient

comment on such explanations: 'Explicatio Σ κατὰ πατέρα συγγενῆς ἡμῖν toleraretur, si Dareus Persarum gentis auctor esset. itaque corruptela subest.' Wilamowitz also notes the impropriety of the form ἀμέτερον: 'ἡμέτερον vulgo editur anapaestorum usui convenienter; ἡ suprascripsit Tr.' He obelises γένος ἀμέτερον.

I suggest that the reading of our MSS. is due to the mistaken incorporation in the text of a reasonable, though technically not quite accurate, scholium. I would assume that, by the intrusion of a gloss, the true reading Δαρείου γένος was first corrupted to Δαρείου γένος: we may compare l. 6 *supra*, where all MSS. read, after Δαρείου γένος, the superfluous words Δαρείου υἱός or υἱὸς Δαρείου. An intelligent critic wrote in the margin: γρ. Δαρείου γένος· τὸ πατρωνυμικόν· γένος ἀμέτερον. 'Read Δαρείου γένος: the patronymic: γένος does not scan.' A copyist took γρ. to refer to the whole note, which he embodied, with the minimum of alteration, in the text: producing a phrase which most critics have accepted as Aeschylus' composition. The Byzantine alteration of ἀμέτερον to ἡμέτερον would have obliterated the last trace of its true source.

The word πατρωνύμιος has no authority, while πατρωνυμικόν is a technical term, though not, in strict terminology, exactly applicable to Δαρείου γένος.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

TACITUS, ANNALS, XVI. 21.

... eaque offensio altius penetrabat, quia idem Thræsea Patavi, unde ortus erat, ludis tæctastis a Troiano Antenore institutis habitu tragico cecinerat.

FOR tæctastis the Edd. have suggested either *cetariis* or *caestatis*. Two documents have been taken as evidence for the existence of games at Patavium called *Cetarii* or *Cetaria*; but the form of the word recorded by Charisius, p. 125 f., Keil, from Pliny's citation of a letter of Pomponius Secundus to Thræsea, throws no light on the context in which it was used; and the *cetae* I., II., III. of C.I.L. V. 2787 (Dessau 5202) would seem to refer to three grades of exhibitions of sea

animals, or some spectacles having to do with these creatures: together with the *epidixib*. which precedes it, I should regard the term as generic, not specific. In any case, 'fishermen's games' would hardly have been celebrated at so long an interval as thirty years, which we learn from Dio Cassius, LXII. 26, to have been the period of the festival at which Thræsea appeared.

Professor Thallon, in *Amer. Journ. of Archaeol.* XXVIII. (1924), p. 51 f., shows that *ludi caestati*, 'games of the cestus,' would have accorded with the local tradition at Patavium. The word *caestatus* does indeed occur once, in connexion with musical and dramatic

spectacles, in the fragmentary inscription from Labicum, *C.I.L.* XIV. 2771 (Bücheler, *Carm. Lat. Epigr.* 236); the Edd. of the *Thes. L.L.* are probably right in taking it there as denoting an actor's headdress, not a boxer's thongs; and this might have been its signification at Patavium.

I propose, however, to read *iselasticis*, on the ground of both palaeographical probability and the sense thus imparted to the passage. *Ludi iselastici*, ἀγῶνες εἰσελαστικοί (as to which institution, see Jüthner in Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. Εἰσελαστικός ἀγών), are probably not mentioned by that name before the principate of Trajan; but the custom appears in the first section of the Preface to Book IX. of Vitruvius, and it is described by Plutarch, *Quaest. Conv.* II. v. 2, in the following terms: τὸ τοῖς νικηφόροις εἰσελαύνονσι τῶν τευχῶν ἐφίεσθαι μέρος διελεῖν καὶ καταβαλεῖν. In attributing the establishment of such games to the Trojan Antenor, the Patavini might have been influenced by the tale of the Wooden Horse.

In our passage, Tacitus is dealing

with events of the year 66 A.D. It was only after Nero's successful appearances in Greece, a year or two later, that the imperial artist could celebrate his triumphal return to Italy by entering her cities through breaches in their walls; the account in Suetonius, *Nero*, XXV. 1, does not make it clear whether he had breaches made in the walls of Antium, Rome, and the imperial villa in the Alban territory, as well as Naples, but for our purpose this point is not essential. The idea of such a triumphal entry had doubtless been germinating in Nero's brain for a considerable time before he put it into effect; and his jealousy was naturally aroused when he learnt that Thrasea had appeared in tragedy, or had given a tragic recital, at Patavium on the occasion of an exceptional festival, the reward for success in which, at least in theory, included triumphal entrance to the successful competitor's own city through a breach in the walls: this represented a height of ambition to which no one at Court might safely aspire.

A. W. VAN BUREN.

MARTIAL IV. 64

(*C.R.* XXXVIII., p. 64).

PROFESSOR ROSE seems to be unaware that the interpretation which he offers of Martial *epigr.* IV. 64, 16 was advanced many years ago by Heinrich Schenkl; see *Mitteil. des k. deutschen Archäol. Inst., Röm. Abt.* XXXI., p. 211 ff.

It seems highly improbable that a ceremony of the unpleasant character which Professor Rose and Schenkl postulate could have taken place in such a public locality as the Campus Martius. It is at least remarkable that there is no more explicit reference to it in Latin literature. One would think that some of the Christian apologists like Tertullian and Arnobius could hardly have failed to make capital out of it. Schenkl's interpretation has, and no doubt will have, adherents. It fits in with Fehle's theories and he blesses it; see *Die kultische Keuschheit im Altertum*, p. 56. But sober authorities like Dr. Wissowa (*Religion und Kultus*, p. 241, n. 10) and the late Dr. Warde Fowler are more cautious. All the passages which Professor Rose, following Gesner, quotes show that Columella's prophylactic was purely magical, and non-Italian at that. Professor Rose recognises the latter fact. It invalidates seriously his speculations regarding the action of the authorities in charge of the grove. Who were these authorities? And is not the evi-

dence for a *lucus* Annae Perennae far from certain?

The whole tenor of Martial's poem is decidedly opposed to the proposed interpretation as well as that which stands second in Professor Rose's list. Martial is describing the peaceful landscape which lies before his eyes as he looks citywards. To interrupt his enumeration of the cool spots which lie immediately outside the city by a reference to an event of the character postulated by Schenkl spoils the passage and results in bathos. I confess that Assmann seems to me to be on the right track. Martial had, one might say, a personal interest in the Aqua Virgo. He mentions it many times. His first lodging looked out on the laurels of Agrippa and close by was the arch which carried the water over the Via Lata (I. 108, IV. 18). When he stood on the northern slope of the Janiculum this aqueduct must have caught his eye at once. It started from the Pincio and extended to the Saepta (Frontinus I. 22). But there are difficulties, as Hülsen showed, if we regard Martial as referring to the Stagnum and Euripus. The scene of the feast of the Ides of March was apparently close to the Piazza del Popolo, for the Vatican Kalendar locates it at the first milestone on the Via Flaminia. Yet it is not impossible that when Martial speaks of the 'nemus Annae Perennae' he means the tree-clad slopes of the

Pincio just above this road. In the neighbourhood were the first arches and the *piscina* of the Virgo. Assmann's *liquore* is certainly not very attractive from a palaeographical point of view; *rigore* (= *criore*) would, perhaps, account better for the corruption. The water of the Virgo was peculiarly cold; see Martial VI. 42, VII. 32, 11, XI. 47, 6, and compare Seneca, *ep.* 83, 5.

Whatever solution of the crux is adopted, I hope that it will be one which will not lessen the charm of Martial's poem. E. H. ALTON.

POSTSCRIPT TO C.R. XXXVIII., p. 64.

EITREM, *Opferitus*, p. 446, sees that Martial's reference to Anna Perenna is to be connected with the charm in Columella, etc., against insects, but appears to think it was considered to be a kind of sacrifice: 'Wie leicht antikem Gedanke der Übergang zum Opfer ist, zeigt Martial,' etc. H. J. ROSE.

VITRUVIUS VII., pref. 12.

postea Silenus de symmetriis doricorum edidit volumen fide aede iononis quae est samii dorica zeodorus.† H.

THIS passage presents a well-known difficulty. The temple of Hera at Samos was Ionic, as appears from extant remains. H warns us that something is wrong by the correction *o* which turns *iononis* into *iunonis*, by *dorica* which is absurd, and by *zeodorus* for *theodorus*, which latter is quite correctly spelt three lines below. But on further consideration these errors are found to conceal behind a very thin veil the probable reading. Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* XXXV. 152—'sunt qui in Samo primos omnium plasticen invenisse Rhoecum et Theodorum tradant'—couples the two names as makers of pottery figures; Pausanias, VIII. 14, 8, as bronze founders. They were like some of the Italian architects of the Renaissance, who were masters in the various plastic arts—Peruzzi for example. Read therefore: 'de aede ionica Iunonis quae est Sami Rhoecus et Theodorus.'

F. GRANGER.

GRATTIANA.

GRATTIVS exponit canes Britannicos parum quidem decoros, sed in uenando paene inuictos esse; describo hos tantum uersus:

179 at magnum cum uenit opus promendae uirtus

et uocat extremo praeceps discrimine Mauors:

non tunc egregios tantum admirere Mol-
< ossos >.

comparat his uersuta suas Athamania . . .

Azorusque Pheraeque et clandestinus Acar-

< nan > . . .

Vltimae syllabae uersuum 181-183 perierunt, sine ullo autem negotio us. 181 et 183 restituti sunt, dubitatur de 182. Editio Aldina recepit *suas Athamania fraudes*, quod nimis quaesitum uidetur, at Vollmer Enkio probante proposuit

gentes. Equidem suppleo *proles*, quod uerbum re uera poeticum est (cf. Cic. *de orat.* III. 153 et Quintil. *inst.* VIII. 3, 26), praeterea in toto carmine uates de canibus loquitur tanquam de hominibus. Singularem huius substantiui numerum adhibet us. 253, uerum plurali utuntur Columella X. 163 (de herbis) et Arnobius IV. 28 *quis est enim qui credat . . . deum . . . ex se proditis aliquando interceptisse proles* et VII. 35 *quas* (sc. *animantes*) *generare auctor uoluit rerum substituendis per libidinem prolibus*.¹

Venatorem capellas leporesue captantem poeta sic monere incipit:

199 at te leue si qua
tangit opus pavidosque iuuat compellere
dorcās
aut uersuta sequi leporis uestigia parui,
Petroniost haec fama cani, uolucresque
Sycambros
et pictam macula uertraham delige falsa.

Pro corrupta uoce *falsa* Johnson substituit *flaua* uel *fulua*. Propius ad traditam scripturam accedit *fusca*. Quis non uidit uertragos albos maculis atrioribus sparsos?

Lepide Grattius indicat qui catulus aliquando ualidis canis uenaticus futurus sit:

293 adfectat materna regna sub aluo,
ubera tota tenet, a tergo liber aperto,
dum tepida indulget terris clementia
mundi;
uerum ubi Caurino perstrinxit frigore
uesper,
ire placet turbaque potens operitur inerti.

Initium uersus 297 corruptum est, cum duae fere litterae omissae esse uideantur. Quodsi attendimus uerbum *perstrinxit* (us. 296) obiectum desiderare, monemur ut *ire* mutemus in *rura*, qua lectione admissa pro *placet* rescribendum erit *latet* ut lucremur hanc sententiam: catulus ille, qui lactens ceteros paruos canes sibi cedere cogit interdiuque aestate libere se mouet, nocte gelida calorem quaerens penitus delitescit sub fratribus. Itaque uitiata distinctione (post 296) sublata edendum censeo:

uerum ubi Caurino perstrinxit frigore uesper
rura, latet turbaque potens operitur inerti.

De curanda scabie cum alia praecipit poeta tum haec:

415 tunc et odorato medicata bitumina uino
Hipponiasque pices neclectaeque unguen
amurcae
miscuit et summam conplectitur ignis in
unam.
inde lauant aegros: *ast* ira coercita morbi
laxatusque rigor. quae te ne cura timentem
420 differat.

Pro *ast* sententia flagitat *quoad*: medicina nimirum usque eo adhibenda est, donec aegroti canes sani facti sunt. Verisimile est pro *quoad* librarium deceptum pronomine *quae*, quod in uersu sequenti eodem fere loco positum est, exarasse *ast*.

Grattius etiam de robore ('stiff cramp') agit, uide us. 464:

quae robore pestis
acrior aut leto propior uia?

¹ Cf. Neue-Wagener, *Formenlehre*, I., p. 658.

In curando robore nonnunquam sanguinem mitti necesse esse docent hi uersus :

469 in subito subita et medicina tumultu.
stringendae nares et . . . na ligamina ferro
armorum, geminaeque cruor ducendus ab
aure.

Ligamina armorum nihil aliud significare nisi umeri commissuram cum brachio perspicue ostendit Enkiaus, qui idem Hauptii coniecturam bina commendauit. Equidem puto compendium scripturae p (=pro) praetermissum esse. Quocirca quin scribendo *prona ligamina* . . . armorum manum poetae restituamus uix dubito, nam peritus auctor dicere uult : non in summo umero sanguinem esse mittendum, sed paulo infra ubi lacerti plerumque curuati sunt. Adiectiuum *pronus* satis certe placuit Gratio, cf. us. 109 *proni* . . . *uulneris* (=apri uulnerati); us. 178 *pronis* . . . *catulis* . . . *Britannis*.

C. BRAKMAN.

Hagae Comitit.

AESCHYLUS, *EUMENIDES* 945.

γόνος | πλουτό-χθων έρμαλαν | δαιμόνων
δδων τίωι.

THE words πλουτό-χθων έρμαλαν allude to the three divinities whose images stood in the sanctuary of the Semnai. Paus. I. 28, 6 : κείται δέ καὶ Ἰλσοῦτων καὶ Ἑρμῆς καὶ Ἰῆς ἀγάλμα. The compressed allusion may be compared to ll. 334-5, where Mrs. Wedd (C.R. XXI. 15) saw a reference to the names of Lachesis, Atropos, and Clotho in the words λᾶχος δαντάλα (=ἀτροπος) μοῖρ' επέκλωσεν. Ἰλσοῦτχθων appears to have been coined for the purpose.

F. M. CORNFORD.

THE TEARS OF NANNAKOS

(Herodas III. 10).

TO the evidence collected in the Headlam-Knox edition should now be added that of an inscription of Lycaonia mentioning a peasant of *Novokokómē*. This inscription definitely proves that the form of the name in the old Iconian legend was Nannakos, not Annakos, and shows that the legendary Anatolian king was not a 'hypostasis' of the Semitic Enoch. *Novokokómē* belongs to a well-known class of Anatolian village names—e.g., Dioskome, Menocome, Asiokome, Attiokome, Atyokhorion, etc.,

applied to villages on temple estates; and it shows that Nonokos was a 'faded' god, or a deified hero worshipped in a local shrine owning land. Nonokos for Nannakos exemplifies a common Anatolian vocalisation—cf. Nanna: Nonna; Anna: Onnes; Tatta: Tottes; Mamma: Momia, etc. (Kretschmer, *Einkl.* p. 335 ff.). A full discussion of the inscription, and of its bearing on the Anatolian legend of the Flood, will be found in a paper on 'Nannakos and Enoch' in the *Journal of the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society*, No. XI. (1924). Professor Rose suggests to me that in the oldest version of the legend the deluge may have been caused by the 'tears of Nannakos.'

W. M. CALDER.

NOTES ON TRYPHIODORUS AND OTHERS.

TRYPHIODORUS 90-92 :

Κληστήν δ' ἐνέθηκε θύρην καὶ κλίμακα τυκτὴν,
ἣ μὲν ὅπως αἰδηλος ἐπὶ πλευρῆς ἀραρυῖα
ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα φέρεται λόχον κλυτόπωλον Ἀχαιῶν,
ἣ δ' ἵνα λυομένη τε καὶ ἔμπεδον εἰς ἐν λούσα
εἴη σφιν καθύπερθε ὁδὸς καὶ νέρβην ὁροῦσαι.

ἔνθ' ἐρέψῃσι, 'cover in,' makes better sense.

16. 371-2 :

ἣ τε θεῶ πλῆγεῖσα παρήγορον ὄμμα τιταίνει
γυμνὸν ἐπισσεῖλουσα κάρη κυανάμπυκι κισσῶ.

Cassandra is the subject. Should we read ἐπισκιδούσα? *ck* may have been misread *cc*.

XENOPHON OF EPHEBUS (205. 14, Didot. Bk. III., ch. 8).

ἐσφάλην ἄρα (πάντα καινά) καὶ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς θανάτου.

Antheia is speaking. Read παντάλαινα.

STOBAEUS, *Flor.* Pythagoras (15. 7) :

Μὴ δαπανᾷν παρὰ καιρὸν ἀπειροκάλως ἐνὶ ἡμῶν
μήδ' ἀνελεύθερος ἵσθι· μέτρον δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἄριστον.

Read ἐλετήμων : 'be not too tender.'

T. W. LUMB.

¹[So in a legend from the State of Washington (see Frazer, *Folk-Lore in the O.T.*, I., p. 325) a flood is caused by the tears of a beaver. Less closely parallel, but geographically nearer, is Astyages' dream in Herodotos I. 107. H. J. R.]

REVIEWS

ROMAN POETRY.

Roman Poetry. By E. E. SIKES, M.A.,
Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College, Cambridge. 8vo. Pp. vi + 280.
London: Methuen and Co. 8s.6d. net.
THE task of scholarship is perpetual re-interpretation. The classics remain; what they mean to us varies; from age

to age, from individual to individual; and even from time to time in the same person according to the shifting of his own parallax. Of poetry this is more particularly true. The essence of poetry is, in Shelley's famous words, to make familiar objects be as if they were

NO. CCXCIV. VOL. XXXVIII.

H

not familiar; and the task, or privilege, of the trained scholar includes an analogous function towards poetry itself, that poetry which otherwise, staled by familiarity, would cease to exercise its virtue.

This reinterpretation or revitalisation of classical poetry, both Greek and Roman, has been in recent years more and more sought after. Mr. Sikes' volume is a valuable contribution to the enterprise. One may accept on the whole (perhaps with some little qualification) his view that 'the present generation has to make an effort unknown to its predecessors to obtain satisfaction from Roman poetry.' The eighteenth century, he goes on to say—and he might have added, part of the nineteenth also—found no such difficulty in adjustment, because it was educated in a Roman tradition and regarded Latin literature as its own inheritance. To reinstate the Roman tradition, only in a larger way, to recover and amplify the inheritance with which some measure of touch has been undoubtedly lost, is one of the most important objects to which we can address ourselves. 'The human race is continuous; so that, if poetry is to maintain its place as one of the permanent records of human emotion, instead of being a fugitive and journalistic expression of the passing hour, the poet must be in the succession.' 'Criticism has now learnt the organic view of poetry, which is a living thing, endowed with the power of absorbing the past and recreating it with the new vitality of its own organism.'

In order to appreciate Roman poetry, in order to enter into this part of our Latin inheritance, we must understand what poetry, both as a function of the human spirit ('the ether doing something,' which is one of the modern definitions of matter) and as an art with its technical rules and its yet more binding traditions, meant to the Latin mind. This is in effect the subject of Mr. Sikes' volume. The apology he makes in his preface for being 'sometimes a little obvious' is graceful, but needless: it is the obvious that has oftenest and most clearly to be pointed out.

His book is not a history of Latin poetry. It is an elucidation of three things all essential to its study and appreciation: (1) the theory of poetry on which the Roman poets, whether consciously or unconsciously, whether by instinct or by training, worked; (2) their attitude as influenced or determined by this body of theory to 'truth' in the double sense of the word, to nature on the one hand, to philosophy on the other; (3) their doctrine and practice as regards language, style, and ornament, that is to say, as regards the armament or apparatus in and through which the poetical impulse embodied itself in the concrete forms of actual poetry.

On all three subjects, Mr. Sikes is throughout no less interesting than illuminating. It may be thought that upon them there is little new to say. That is a fallacy. What is important is the freshness of approach. Scholars, when they have turned from the purely 'grammatical' or technical side of their profession, have too often contented themselves, in their further task of bringing their studies into touch with life, with repeating the commonplaces of criticism. From this volume even accomplished scholars may learn much, may derive real profit. And a claim which the author himself does not make may be made for him, that his study of Latin poetry does not lend itself to the pernicious abuse of a substitute; that it does not interpose an opaque medium between the student and the subject, or tempt its readers to be content with reading what somebody says about poetry instead of reading the poets themselves.

A summary or analysis can hardly be given of a closely-wrought volume every page in which deserves and repays careful reading. Some particular points may be singled out, without the implication that they are of special importance.

1. The view that Roman critics from Cicero onwards tended to regard poetry as a species of rhetoric is perhaps a little over-emphasised. It is due to the fact that so much of Roman criticism is purely technical, the work of grammarians rather than of men of letters.

But against the *finitimus oratori poeta* and the *proxima cognatio cum oratoribus* of Cicero, we must set the no less important *magis oratoribus quam poetis imitandus* of Quintilian, and the fact that it is not oratory but history—history, that is, treated as a fine art—which he singles out as akin to poetry. And Quintilian's dictum that poetry *solum petit voluptatem*, besides being a corrective to the idea (popular then as now) that poetry is to be judged by its 'utility,' its direct intellectual or ethical content, is also a claim that its aim is higher, that its function is to reveal or interpret beauty. In discriminating between the Greek and the Roman view of poetry, Mr. Sikes observes that 'a nation of artists was not likely to undervalue the counter-claims of art.' But the Greeks were not, and there never has been, a nation of artists.

2. 'The full flower of classicism is to be found in Horace.' This is both a true and a courageous thing to say. 'His appeal to the moderns has waned,' Mr. Sikes goes on; 'his sentiments are reckoned as commonplace, his attitude to life as hedonism, his personal expression too objective for a lyric poet.' These criticisms, he rightly points out, are for the most part either untrue or irrelevant; they are based on a misconception of poetry and of Horace: and 'the complaint that Shakespeare wrote little except hackneyed quotations is not helpful to criticism.'

3. The discussion in Chapter III., of the regular and unconcealed practice by Roman poets of 'borrowing from' or 'imitating' both the Greek poets and their own predecessors or coevals, is excellent. It was the ancient lack of historical perspective (for the historical method is one of the few creations of the modern world) which diverted criticism from the essence to the superficial form. So likewise it is the abuse of the historical method which in turn diverts it from the organic life of poetry to analysis of its mechanical constituents. 'For Lucretius to imitate Ennius, for Virgil to imitate both, was not merely the sincerest flattery; it was a claim to be in the succession.' What we do find in Latin poetry at its culmination is 'conscious and deliberate archaism

replaced by delicate suggestion and subtle reminiscence.'

4. 'It was when the Roman commentators came to details that the real mischief began.' That has not ceased to be true now. An instance of it comes a few pages later: it is one of the few passages in the book with which disagreement may be expressed.

'Virgil's early work, at any rate, was not entirely free from the literary vice of Alexandria. He could write

*cessere magistri
Phillyrides Chiron Amythaoniusque
Machaon.*

This has no doubt a fine ring, recalling the organ-voice of Miltonic names; but compared with the simplicity of Lucretius—if we may here venture on a "parallel passage"—

mussabat tacito medicina dolore

the erudition (as modern editors have seen) strikes us as frigid and pedantic.'

That both the Lucretius and the Virgil should be misquoted here is a strange lapse. 'Always verify your references' is a maxim which no one can afford to neglect, and least of all where it seems most superfluous. Observance of this hard but necessary rule would have kept Mr. Sikes from misquoting two of the best-known lines in Virgil and Tennyson (*Ecl.* I. 82 on p. 113 and the last line of the *Come down, O Maid* idyl in *The Princess* on p. 263), though it is not a thing where those who have made similar lapses themselves will be inclined to be hard on him. But the point of substance to be urged is more important: it is, that the alleged simplicity of Lucretius is no more simple than the wonderful romantic touch of Virgil: if one is pedantic, so is the other. Both are in fact, in their different ways, a triumphant success poetically.

5. There is an excellent passage in Chapter VI. on the effort of the *graecissantes* being not to sweeten the language so much as to test its capacity of assimilation without ceasing to be Latin. The same sort of effort has been made at each nodal point in English poetry.

6. The discussion of the use of con-

sonantal assonance in poetry, pp. 255-271, assigns to this what may be thought undue importance. It is easy to drive this search up a blind alley. There are after all a very limited number of consonants to play with; and the 'significance of *m*' has to be discounted by considering what a common letter *m* is.

7. The reasons for the decay of Latin poetry, like those for the decay of the Roman Empire, have been sought in many quarters. Mr. Sikes pronounces in favour of the explanation offered by Velleius Paterculus, that it was impossible to surpass or equal the models of the past, and that accordingly *studium cum spe senescit*. This is doubtful. Velleius wrote, it must be remembered, in the reign of Tiberius. It was a slack

time in Roman letters, after the brilliance of the Augustans; but surely it was not until much later that hope for their future was given up. His further remark, that restless pursuit of novelty, *frequens ac mobilis transitus*, is a hindrance to production of first-rate work, though Mr. Sikes regards it as at least disputable, is perhaps more to the point. In any case the ghost of that competent official and mediocre man of letters would surely be pleased to know that he was credited, by a literary critic of nineteen centuries after him, with 'masterly insight.'

The volume ought to be largely read; for no one can read it without profit as well as pleasure.

J. W. MACKAIL.

THE LEGACY OF ROME.

The Legacy of Rome. Essays by C. FOLIGNO, ERNEST BARKER, etc. One vol. Octavo. Pp. xii + 512; 32 plates and 36 figures in text. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1923. 8s. 6d.

THIS is an admirable book; better than its colleague on Greece. Doubtless, in one sense, it was easier to write. The book on Greece had necessarily to deal principally with her achievements, and, except in the realm of the physical sciences, there is a lack of freshness in the subject. That on Rome is concerned more with the transmission of the legacy, and is therefore largely concerned with the end of the Western Empire and the Dark Ages, and to some extent (it might well have been more) with the Renaissance; this, for a book of this kind, is almost new ground. There is a freshness and vigour in almost every chapter, suggesting that the writers had each something to say and wanted to say it, and had not merely been asked to write an essay of thirty pages on a well-worn theme; these qualities find their way even into the unpromising subject of Family and Social Life, though Mr. Last, like other writers, lays too much stress on the decay of morals at Rome, and allows himself such statements as that home-life was hardly known in the East and was of no importance in Greece. The

two most interesting chapters are perhaps those by Professor Foligno on the Transmission of the Legacy—a very lucid account—and by Professor de Zulueta on Law; and Dr. Singer gives a very interesting and full account of Roman Science. This last, however, suggests a criticism. Dr. Singer states, of course, that through all the centuries of the Empire the Romans added little or nothing to the method of science, or even to the number of scientific observations. He mentions, for example, the dependence of Avienus on Aratus, though an interval of six centuries separates them, and that of Pliny on Eratosthenes. But it requires more emphasis. It is after all a remarkable phenomenon, one of the most remarkable in the history of civilisation, and to it is doubtless due much of the unscientific character of the subsequent centuries. At the same time it was a pity to give no account of such work as was done by contemporary Greeks—Strabo, Dioscorides, Galen, Diophantus (the work of Ptolemy only is described)—for the Roman Empire included Greece.

It used to be a common error that the Romans were as weak in art as in science. Mr. Rushforth has written an excellent chapter on Roman art, but in one point he implies that they achieved more than they did; in his anxiety to

show that there is such a thing as Roman art, he overlooks a significant failure. 'The Imperial position and destinies of Rome,' he says, 'provided a theme or a background of unparalleled grandeur; and before the first century was out a Roman Imperial art had come into existence.' True enough; but what is significant is that there is no art which truly embodied the idea of the Empire as did Virgil and Livy in literature. The Arch of Trajan or the relief of the Eagle cannot be placed beside the *Aeneid*, as one would place the Parthenon beside the *Antigone*. Why this is so we do not know; perhaps, after all, the majority of the artists were Greeks outside the true Roman tradition.

Another point. There would have been a gain in clearness if, somewhere, there had been an explanation of the difference between the transmission of the Roman legacy and the Greek. For the difference lies not only in the fact that part of the Roman legacy has reached us 'by a natural process, handed down from people to people and from one generation to another, through traditions that could not be rooted out, through legends, customs, intellectual outlooks, rough elaborations of artistic conceptions,' as Professor Foligno puts it. There is a difference also in the way the modern world has been influenced by the Greek legacy and by that part of the Roman which, 'perhaps richer in itself, was gradually recovered by the ceaseless efforts, the toil and the study, excavations and investigations of scholars during the last centuries of the Middle Ages and the Modern epoch.' No Greek work, with the possible exception of Aristotle, influenced writers and artists of the Renaissance in the

same way as did, for example, Plautus, Terence, and Seneca on the one hand, and Vitruvius on the other. More might have been said of the latter's influence by Professor Giovannoni, of the dramatists by Dr. Mackail; more detail given. Dr. Mackail emphasises indeed the influence of the Roman writers, but by general statement only, which is not so useful to the public. Contrast the chapter on language by the late Dr. Bradley, where much illuminating detail is given. In fact, Dr. Mackail is more concerned with the actual achievements of Roman literature, and exaggerates in consequence. It is exaggeration, for instance, to say of Lucretius' poem that 'it is the work of an intellect and imagination of the first order, of a scientific insight and an ethical elevation unequalled in the ancient world, and hardly reached afterwards by any single writer'; and of Cicero that 'his mastery of language and his sense of literary form gave them [Greek philosophical works] a wholly new vitality,' though it is true that 'his genius brought Greek thought within the compass of the Western mind.' It would be surprising too to read that the rediscovery of Menander 'has emphasised our appreciation of Plautus and Terence as dramatists of high genius,' if we were not by this time used to such judgments on Menander.

But all such are small blemishes in an excellent work which should, and perhaps will, reach a very wide public. It is, however, a pity that, in such a work, Mr. Asquith should have permitted himself to say that in Greek States, 'even in the *ἑσχατος δῆμος* of Athens' a 'small aristocratic minority . . . was in exclusive possession both of freedom and of power.'

A. W. GOMME.

THE HOPE VASES.

The Hope Vases (A Catalogue and a discussion of the Hope Collection of Greek Vases, with an Introduction on the History of the Collection and on Late Attic and S. Italian Vases). By E. M. W. TILLYARD. Demy 4to. One vol. Pp. x+180. With 43 plates. Cambridge: University Press, 1923. £4 4s.

OF a certain class of South Italian wares Mr. Tillyard writes that they 'have a strong claim to being judged, among not a few competitors, as the ugliest of all South Italian vase-groups.' At the sale of the Hope Collection in 1917 the present writer, engaged in looking at some of this class and trying mentally to appraise their curious

supremacy in ugliness, was assured by an enthusiastic stranger that the severe archaic stuff was all very well, but that these South Italian vases were *the* Greek vases *par excellence*. It is well that Sir William Hamilton, who formed the collection, had a taste catholic enough to embrace both extremes: for without the one we should have been poor indeed; and without the other we should probably have missed the most valuable part of Mr. Tillyard's book. But his was no small mind of whom it can be said (by Mr. Tillyard, quoting from Tischbein's memoirs) that he 'loved two things in particular, Greek vases and volcanoes,' and who, living at Naples, was 'luckily able to enjoy them both.' Of the two great collections Hamilton formed, the first, as is well known, passed in its entirety to the British Museum in 1772. The second, whose varied and in part sensational fortunes Mr. Tillyard recounts in his Introduction, was finally dispersed in 1917 at the sale of the Hope Heirlooms (sculpture and vases) from the Deepdene, near Dorking, long the property of the Hope family.

Deplorable as it was from the point of view of the study of Greek vase-painting, this dispersal would have meant a still more irreparable loss to students and to the public, had not the exacting task of describing and photographing the 300 and more vases been undertaken in time by expert hands. As it was, the interruption of his work by the war, and the difficulty afterwards of discovering the new location of each vase, must have made Mr. Tillyard's task immeasurably heavier. The volume before us, sumptuously produced by the Cambridge University Press, is in every way worthy of the cause it serves. Arranged and classified with the precision of a catalogue, it is yet full of refreshment to the reader, be he specialist or no. Whether he is making allowance for the frailties even of Greek craftsmen, or quoting the solemn opinions of scholars on subjects of which the plain man is a far better judge, Mr. Tillyard is never deserted by his sense of humour and proportion. In fact he is always on the side of the plain man; not least when he disposes of a well-

meant hypothesis with the withering remark that 'Greek artists were not in the habit of representing centaurs and Lapiths sitting down in amity to the wedding-breakfast of Pirithous' (p. 67). A pleasant humanity and a faculty for minute observation combine to give us many fresh points, such as the comparison of the character of silens in earlier and in later red-figure art, on p. 73.

Quite apart from its value as a catalogue, the book carries the study of Greek vase-painting a step further. In his discussion of the various groups of South Italian vases and of the late Attic wares which are occasionally confused with them, Mr. Tillyard breaks new ground. The subject is complex, and the chart which he gives us is admittedly only an outline. But it is no small service to have made more generally known in England the work of the Italian pioneers in this field—Gabrici, Patroni, Macchioro, and to some extent Ducati—and to pay to their work the tribute of argued criticism and differing conclusions.

Perhaps the most striking single contribution which Mr. Tillyard makes to the study of this part of the subject, is that he disengages from the mass of degraded or half-understood Greek forms and traditions in which the South Italian vase-painters' art is swathed something that may really be called native: the vigour and the spirit of burlesque which find their best expression in such pieces as the Dolon krater in the British Museum and the krater No. 208 in the Hope Collection. It is tempting to bring this point into connexion with the strong claim that has been made of late for the recognition of an original, native element in Roman sculpture. For, paradoxical as it may sound, portraiture and burlesque are the expression in different moods of the same realistic vein.

Before dealing with the various phases and subdivisions of South Italian vase-painting itself, Mr. Tillyard has something to say about the later stages of Attic vase-painting from Meidias onward—a notoriously meagre chapter in the history of the subject. By following the development of the

bell-krater shape he establishes a more definite chronology for the period, and he shows how wide a gap of time and temperament separates the cloying Meidian style from the work of the 'Kertch' period (half a century later) with its 'unostentatious grace' and 'deliberately lowered vitality.' He also brings out the three-dimensional character of the Meidian age by reminding us of the many vases painted in a totally different manner which form the background to the Meidian school and its vogue.

Some space is devoted to distinguishing this late Attic work from the earlier examples of South Italian work done under Attic influence.

For a final classification of South Italian vase-types the time is not yet ripe. In spite of much work done, especially by the Italian scholars mentioned, every new classification is liable to be modified continually by the results of excavation on one new site after another; as it is, there is wide divergence of opinion between scholars as to the homes of the more important styles and the chief centres of production.

In his discussion of individual vases Mr. Tillyard has some stimulating suggestions to make; notably with regard to the high-girt Artemis with a stag on a Nolan amphora (No. 95) which he claims as one of the earliest known examples of the type and connects with the statue made for Calydon by Menaechmus and Soidas (Paus. VII. 18. 9).

On the literary side, he makes the suggestion, which is at least plausible, that the scene on vase No. 136 is based on the satyric play *Ἡφαιστος* known to have been written by Achaëus of Eretria. The inscription on this bell-krater, *καλὸς ἠφαιστος* (*sic*), was discovered by Mr. Tillyard only after the publication of the picture in A. B. Cook's *Zeus* (I. pl. 39, No. 1), in which therefore it does not appear. The question of satyr-plays represented on vases, an extraordinarily interesting one, is raised by no less than three pieces in this catalogue, and references are given.

Of the more important vases and fragments, clear drawings of good size are given, and care is taken in the text

to point out the errors and omissions—often of a flagrant kind—in some of the older reproductions which were till now the only ones available. Of the figured vases some 200 have been photographed by Mr. Tillyard and are given on 30 plates. A careful index is not wanting. It should also be mentioned that Mr. Tillyard has been able to include some valuable fresh material put at his disposal by Mr. J. D. Beazley.

Few slips occur even in the technical parts of the text: one may note a comma left out after 'incision' on p. 24 (third line from the bottom), and r. (wrist) instead of l. on p. 142 (fourth line from top). Should not reference have been made on p. 6 to Ducati's substantial monograph *Saggio di studio sulla ceramica attica figurata del secolo IV av. Cristo* (Rome 1916)? On the bell-krater No. 24 it is hardly credible that Dionysus should really be 'prodding' the silen: the attitude of the latter, with the part supposed to be hurt thrust forward, is against it, and so is the negligent way in which Dionysus carries his thyrsus. The silen seems rather to be acting a part, with Dionysus and Maenad as half-contemptuous spectators: the part would be that of a writhing and bellowing victim. If it were not for the absence of 'make-up,' one would suppose another scene from a satyric play.

Too much stress can hardly be laid on the service which this book renders in placing on record the present whereabouts of the vases. When we consider that until quite recently the Hope Collection was, for all practical purposes, inaccessible, we need not regret too acutely a dispersal which has caused some of the most charming, if not the most famous, of the pieces to find their way into galleries where the public may come to know and to enjoy them. The Ashmolean Museum in particular may be congratulated on securing the fragment (No. 137, pl. 22) with a representation of Danaë in the chest, with her child Perseus. She sits with her head bowed forward and half-hidden by a veil; and it is impossible not to feel the inner harmony rare in the relations of Greek art with literature—

between the spirit of this Danae and the lines in Simonides' poem, where she prays :

ὅττι δὲ θαρσάλων ἔπος
εὐχομαι καὶ νόσφι δίκας, σύγγνωθι μοι.

MARY BRAUNHOLTZ.

THE CRAFT OF ATHENIAN POTTERY.

The Craft of Athenian Pottery. By GISELA M. A. RICHTER, Litt.D. One vol. Pp. xiii + 113; 89 half-tone and black-and-white illustrations. Yale University Press; London: Milford, 1923. 25s. net.

It is surprising that the writers on vase-technique have hitherto never worried to learn to make a vase themselves. Miss Richter, disturbed, as she tells us, by the questions of some practical potters to whom she had been lecturing some years ago, decided that she had better go to a pottery school. She went, learnt to make vases, and has now given us the result of her experience and experiments. Her little book is excellent: clear, concise, restrained, and, as the subject demands, businesslike. Most descriptions of technical processes are difficult to follow, but Miss Richter is perfectly lucid in describing the manufacture of vases. The first chapter (which occupies the bulk of the book) describes in detail the various processes from the preparation of the clay to the finishing of the pot ready for the market; the second chapter describes and discusses the antique representations of potters at work; the third chapter is a little *corpus* of passages from ancient authors and inscriptions bearing on the potter's craft, with brief comments. All the processes are clearly and fully illustrated by pictures of actual vases and of potters at their work.

It is impossible in a brief space to comment on all the many interesting conclusions Miss Richter reaches. She has settled a number of points, most of them conclusively. A few examples must suffice. Reichold's theory that the ἐποίησεν vase-signatures refer not to the potter but to the draughtsman who sketched the picture is, her experience convinces her, false, for the potter of a fine specimen had every reason to be proud of himself. Attic vases showing signs of the most accurate and minute finish, Mr. Hambidge's

theories of 'dynamic symmetry' are not to be rejected on grounds of technique. We learn that the kylix was the hardest shape to make, and that making and applying of handles are ticklish jobs. Miss Richter is of the opinion that the Attic pot was painted before firing, and fired once, not twice; and, unless unexpected evidence turns up, one may say she has settled the controversy on these questions. There are some very interesting pages on the use of red ochre—an old point of dispute—in which she proves that red-figure Attic vases were washed on the outside with a pigment of red ochre before they were decorated or fired. No one who has had much to do in handling Attic vases is likely to disagree. Finally, it may be noted that Miss Richter believes that Attic vases were utensils, not nicknacks. She will have the sympathy of all English people who regret the ornamentation of the native lodging-house; they will prefer to think of a krater being carried into the dining-room for the mixing of wine rather than standing on a bracket in the drawing-room. That the Attic pottery trade should concern articles of use and not 'presents from Athens' is not unimportant to the student of Greek economics.

There is a slip in line 3 of page 71, 'bell krater' for 'kalyx krater.' Miss Richter's argument (p. 101) that the giving of vases as prizes in games indicates a certain social status of the makers of vases is not sound. Panathenaic vases are reputed to have held sacred oil, and the giving of vases was probably a religious convention. No one, as far as I know, argues that the makers of communion-plate must have a certain social status.

Miss Richter's book will be invaluable to students of Greek vases, and interesting both to the student of any kind of pottery and to anyone concerned with the social life of the Greeks.

E. M. W. TILLYARD.

THE TEUBNER TEXT OF THE PSEUDO-ARISTOTELIAN
PROBLEMATA.

Aristotelis quae feruntur Problemata Physica. Edidit CAROLUS AEMILIUS RUELLE; recognovit HERMANNUS KNOELLINGER. Editionem post utriusque mortem curavit praefatione ornavit JOSEPHUS KLEK. Pp. xvi + 317. Leipzig: Teubner, 1922.

THIS edition is based in the main upon the work of the late C. E. Ruelle, who died at an advanced age in 1912. After his death the work was continued by H. Knoellinger, and was announced for publication when the war broke out. Knoellinger having been killed in action, Joseph Klek has completed the work.

The present is not the occasion to deal with the interesting problems of the authorship and sources of the *Problemata*, and the following remarks will be strictly confined to the text.

Anyone who has used Bekker's text of this work must recognise that it is far from satisfactory. The present text is to some extent an improvement, chiefly owing to Ruelle's new and careful collation of the best existing MS., Y^a (Parisinus 2036); his collation for the first time of A^p (Bibl. Nat. 1865) is of less importance, since it is obviously inferior to the Vatican and Laurentian MSS., X^a and C^a. A careful examination of the text leaves the impression that it is capable of still further improvement. The nineteenth book, a *locus classicus* on Greek music, has had countless commentators, who have provided an embarrassing array of suggested emendations; but the work as a whole had only previously been studied systematically by Sylburgh, Bekker, Bussemaker, and Bonitz.

Lack of space forbids a detailed criticism, and I shall merely attempt to point out some of the sources from which improvements might be derived.

Firstly, the early Latin versions, especially that of Theodore Gaza, who evidently had access to better MSS. than those which exist to-day, have already been extensively used, especially by Sylburgh. There are, however,

numerous other passages where Gaza's version supplies the right reading. To give a few examples: 906a 5, τὸ αὐτὸ πλεῖον <τοῦ μείον>ος; 918b 10, διὰ τὸ ἀνάλογον· <τὸ δὲ ἀνάλογον> ἰσότης; 924b 31, τὰ δὲ <νεώτερα> ἀσθενέστερα; 937a 36, ἐπὶ τῷ σώματι ὃν (for ἐπεὶ τὸ σωματίον); 954b 19, ἐπιπόλαια (contrasted with ὅσοις εἰς βάθος, l. 20) for παλαιά.

Secondly, parallel passages in the *Problemata* will often supplement one another: e.g. 874b 11-13 is obviously a 'doublet' in a very fragmentary condition of 872b 26-31, and should be restored accordingly; again, in 897a 33 πάχος should be read for πάθος, cf. 871a 26 and G.A. 739a 12.

Thirdly, since many passages are derived from other works in the Aristotelian Corpus and from Theophrastus, these will often supply the right reading: e.g. 869a 7, ἀλλ' ἡ διὰ τὸ μάλλον <ἐκθερμαίνεσθαι> from Theophr. *de sudore*, 36; 924b 8, ἐτι δὲ ἡ (for ἐν ἡ) παράσαξις ἀλέαν ποιεῖ (for ποιεῖν) ὥστε . . . ἀνιέναι (for ἐνιέναι) from *id. de caus. plant.* V. 6, 5; 941a 38 τοῦ ἡλίου <οὐ> πόρρω ὄντος from *id. de ventis*, 49; 942a 24, λοιπόν for the meaningless θερμόν (*ib.* 36); 950a 12, ὁρῶν μὲν γὰρ ὁ λέων (for ὁρῶν) from *E.N.* 1118a 19 ff.

Lastly, it would be possible to compile a list of numerous small emendations which seem worthy of adoption: e.g. 864b 32, ὅπως for ὅτι ὥς; and 960a 27, ὁρᾷ for δρᾷ (both suggested by H. P. Richards); 896b 12, οἰοῦν for ὅτι πᾶν (Platt); and 936a 31, οὐ κωλύει (*cf.* l. 29) for οὕτω λυεῖ.

Misprints in the text and notes are not infrequent. At 964b 9 a whole line has fallen out of the text.

The preface contains a valuable bibliography, which should, however, have included Mr. H. P. Richards' illuminating comments on a number of passages in his *Aristotelica*, and articles by Professors Bywater and Platt (*J. of Ph.* XXXII, pp. 107 ff., 298 f.).

EDWARD S. FORSTER.

SCHOOLS OF GAUL.

Schools of Gaul: A Study of Pagan and Christian Education in the Last Century of the Western Empire. By THEODORE HAARHOFF. 8vo. Pp. 272. Oxford: University Press. 12s. 6d. net.

A humble apology for the tardy appearance of this notice is due to Mr. Haarhoff from some person or persons unknown as well as from the present reviewer.

A good account in English of Gallo-Roman education in the fourth and fifth centuries of our era was certainly a *desideratum*. Mr. Haarhoff has produced a very readable book on the subject. His treatise, which has grown out of a thesis for an Oxford degree, bears ample evidence of painstaking research. The author is manifestly anxious to avoid making unsupported statements, and it is pleasant to find that some more or less serious misconceptions which appear in other works on the subject find no place in this one. But while gladly acknowledging that the work has considerable merits, and is a notably good specimen of a scholar's *primitiae*, one must confess that it might be much improved by drastic revision and ruthless excision. It has many of the faults of the average thesis. Irrelevancies are many and extensive, facts and quotations are sometimes dragged in by the heels, and the arrangement of matter in the various sections occasionally leaves a good deal to be desired. Some of the introductory sections, such as those on 'Celtic influence' and on 'Germanic influence,' are not only unnecessarily rambling, but in parts quite misleading. The statement (pp. 16 f.) that 'the style of Sidonius . . . undoubtedly owes its exotic character in order, rhythm, and vocabulary to Celtic and Gothic influence' is only less horrible than the evidence given in the footnote to support it. It is true that Mr. Haarhoff is not the first to say this sort of thing, but one is sorry to find him reiterating with such emphasis a glaringly erroneous opinion. A similar but more excusable docility leads him (p. 19) to follow Jung in a very questionable

inference from certain inscriptions of Arles and Trèves; but even Hirschfeld is similarly rash in the case of Autun. The statement (p. 21) about Bissula, the slave-girl who fell into the hands of Ausonius, is a good deal worse than far-fetched; and the section in which it occurs shows in general a certain lack both of clearness and of exactness. The last paragraph on p. 23 (on the knowledge of Latin among the Goths) is rather obscure. After drawing a distinction between the nobles and the lower classes as regards acquaintance with the Latin tongue, the author mentions a case where an interpreter was required, but leaves the reader in doubt as to whether such help was required by both classes of the people. In the next case mentioned, that of the embassy of Epiphanius to Euric, the use of an interpreter probably implies that the Visigothic prince knew only the popular spoken Latin, and did not feel confidence in his ability to understand and fittingly answer the rounded periods and polished language of the Roman orator; and as Epiphanius had come on a very delicate mission, it was important that he should be fully understood. Mr. Haarhoff is not ignorant of the fact that there was more than one kind of Latin, but in the section in question he does not seem to bear it sufficiently in mind.

Part II.A is headed, 'The General Prosperity of the Schools in the Fourth and Fifth Centuries.' This heading inspires one with grave fears, which are unfortunately confirmed by the chapter which follows. One cannot safely lump together the fourth and fifth centuries in this way. The Gaul of Ausonius is not the Gaul of Sidonius. No doubt we may talk of 'prosperity of the schools in the fourth century,' even perhaps to the end of the first quarter of the fifth; but after that time there is no real evidence of prosperity. It is even hard to prove beyond a doubt that any Gallic town possessed a state school in that later period. This is not to say that higher education was not common among the Gallo-Roman nobility; teachers were, of course, to

be found. But Rome no longer had either power or motive to foster the old system, and the glib affirmations so often made about Gothic or Burgundian support of education at this time rest on a very slender foundation.

In his account of the organisation of the schools Mr. Haarhoff has much that is interesting to say; and if his attempts to fill from other quarters the gaps in our knowledge of Gaul do not always inspire confidence, one is more inclined to sympathise than to find fault.

Part III., on 'Christian Education,' leaves a good deal to be desired. And no wonder. It is impossible to crowd into a few years the work of half a lifetime. Mr. Haarhoff has attempted too much; but even in the less successful parts of the book he makes some valuable remarks. It is to be hoped that he will continue to work in the field in which he has already staked a very promising claim.

W. B. ANDERSON.

THE MONUMENTUM ANCYRANUM.

The Monumentum Ancyranum. Edited by E. G. HARDY. Pp. 166. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1923. Price 8s. 6d.

IN this compact and unpretending volume Dr. Hardy has at last given us the English edition of the *Monumentum Ancyranum* for which we have been waiting; one which shows the accurate scholarship, historical judgment, and lucid exposition which we have learned to expect from him. Candidates for *Literae Humaniores* or the Classical Tripos, Part II., and all who appreciate and value the work of Augustus or are interested in the Roman Empire, will be well advised to purchase a copy of this edition of 'perhaps the most interesting and important inscription that has ever come to light.'

Each section of the *Monumentum* is treated separately, a terse translation and adequate commentary being given; and the very detailed analysis at the beginning renders an index superfluous. Although the book is professedly based on Mommsen's edition, and the editor modestly disclaims originality, the treatment is always fresh and scholarly. I would single out for praise the handling of the vexed question of the censuses held by Augustus, and the excellent account of the Armenian and Parthian problems, and of the efforts made by Augustus to solve them; there is a good section upon the Arabian expedition and on Indian trade, and the way in which Augustus clung to the old republican customs and religious usages is well brought out, while such

minor points as the use that Suetonius or Velleius made of the *Monumentum*, and the inaccuracies of Dio, are all discussed.

Still, there are one or two changes that should be made in the second edition. Dr. Hardy is not always quite fair to Augustus: thus on p. 16 he charges him with 'family pride' and 'personal vanity,' though he is compelled to acknowledge (on p. 106) the 'extraordinary brevity and meagreness' with which Augustus records the celebration of the *ludi saeculares*. I would question the statement (p. 37) that Augustus' 'best deserved triumph was that for the useful frontier work accomplished by the Illyrian campaigns,' which appears to rob him of any credit for delivering Rome from the peril of an Eastern capital and Oriental forms of government. When the editor rightly notices the delicate way in which Augustus avoids all mention of his defeated Roman adversaries, Sextus Pompeius and Antony (pp. 27 and 108), and his remarkable refusal of the pontificate until Lepidus died (p. 65), it seems a pity to reproduce as trustworthy the insinuations of Tacitus (p. 73), or to talk of 'an unreal show of deference to the Senate' (p. 77). It is true that Augustus was a master of cautious compromise and a consummate diplomat, but that does not make him a monster of dissimulation.

Although Mommsen's text has been closely followed (with occasional variations, as on p. 117, where Wölfflin's emendation is accepted), room might

have been found for Hirschfeld's 'veniam petentibus' on p. 32, for Haverfield's 'intra perpaucos dies' on p. 44, and for Wirtz' 's.c. mecum' on p. 106. On p. 66 the text should surely read 'Fortunae Reducis,' and on p. 99 ought not 'ad aede Apollinis' to read 'ad aedem Apollinis'? In the preface note should possibly have been made

of Dr. Fairley's Philadelphia edition, and on p. 12 the appearance of *C.I.L.* III. is dated ten years too early (1863 instead of 1873).

But all these are very slight and easily corrigible blemishes in a welcome work. No student of the Roman Empire can afford to remain without it.

M. P. CHARLESWORTH.

WYLIE'S CORREALITY AND SOLIDARITY.

Correality and Solidarity. By J. K. WYLIE. One vol. Pp. xvi+365. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1923. 18s.

MONOGRAPHS on special points in Roman Law are rare in this country, and Professor Wylie is the first among us to produce such a work in which an attempt is made to reconstruct the classical law by applying to Justinian's texts the critical method compendiously called the study of Interpolations. The author attacks a problem which has had many solutions: the determination of the principle on which, in some joint obligations, the bringing of an action between any pair of the parties ended the obligation altogether, while there were others in which, though this effect was not produced at strict law, there was equitable relief. He also propounds the view that sometimes where there was not such unity of *causa* and object that action brought between two parties 'consumed' the whole obligation, satisfaction to, or by, one of the parties ended it, at strict classical law, without the help of equitable relief, and quite apart from the substitution of satisfaction for action brought, which Justinian has introduced into so many texts.

The subject is technical: a full review in these pages is hardly called for, but something must be said of the author's use of his method. The book is not easy, but that is not his fault: the topic is difficult. His reasoning is mostly clear and sound and his indications of interpolations are cautious and sober, in refreshing contrast to some continental work.

The cogency of reasoning, however, depends on the soundness of the assumptions, and some of his doctrine

rests on doubtful bases. He tells us—it appears indeed as a Leitmotiv at many points—that active joint obligation leads 'naturally' to partition, while on the passive (*i.e.*, the debtor's) side it leads 'naturally' to solidarity. In proof, we are told that each creditor has his interest, and wants his part, but is indifferent as to which debtor pays. This assumes that debtors have no interest, or none that the law takes into account. That was hardly the attitude of the law, *e.g.*, in alternative obligations. In *mutuum* to two we are expressly told that the obligation was divided, apart from express agreement (C. 4. 2. 12). The fact that it was unilateral hardly suffices to base the view that it was differently treated from other *credita*; indeed, the same effect is indicated in other cases, *e.g.*, in D. 21. 1. 44. 1 (bilateral); D. 45. 2. 11. 2 (unilateral).

To show that a text is altered is one thing: to reconstruct the original is another, and here the author is adventurous. Verbal accuracy is not in question, but substantial accuracy is doubtful in many cases. He speaks of his reconstructed texts as 'authorities': they are in fact illustrations, showing what a text may originally have said, if his conclusions on principle are sound. A text dealing with joint obligation (D. 45. 2. 12. 1) he alters (p. 109) introducing sureties, a peregrine, and a *stipulatio post mortem*, of all of which the text has no sign. Another, on the same topic (D. 45. 2. 3. 1.), he so alters (p. 126) as to introduce sureties taken *in provincia*, the *lex Furia de sponsu*, and the question whether *fidepromissores* had the *beneficium divisionis*. His justification here is that the text is from Ulpian, *ad Sabinum*, 47,

and 'almost all the fragments we possess from' this *liber* 'have some relation to suretyship' (p. 53). 'Some relation' is vague: in fact, the majority of the texts from this *liber* have no references to sureties, and a glance at this and the neighbouring *libri* in Lenel's *Palingenesia* will show that joint and accessory stipulations were both discussed in *liber* 47. But, apart from this, the odds against such elaborate reconstructions are incalculably great. There are others of the same kind. One reconstruction seems impossible. D. 13. 5. 18. 3 begins 'Vetus fuit dubitatio an qui hac actione egit (actio de constituto) sortis obligatio consumat.' He substitutes: 'Vetus est dubitatio an qui ex hac actione solvit sortis obligationem consumat' (p. 185). This is language never found. 'Consumere' an obligation

is to absorb it into another. Release by payment, direct or indirect, is found in many texts, but the form is always 'liberat reum,' 'proficit reo,' or the like. This text is considered in connexion with the author's view that where there is no 'correal' unity, there may yet in some cases be civil discharge by payment by or to a party. This discussion is a good example of the author's method. Like his other reasonings it shows insight and knowledge. But it is highly *a priori* (the texts are of little service), and the conclusion cannot be said to be proved. The writer has a fertile mind and is a good critic, and many of his observations are illuminating. The further works on allied topics, which are promised, will be welcome. They will be the better if the author is a little less dogmatic.

W. W. BUCKLAND.

THE LOEB CICERO.

Cicero: Pro Archia, Post Reditum in Senatu, Post Reditum ad Quirites, De Domo sua, De Haruspicum Responsis, Pro Plancio. By N. H. WATTS. One vol. Pp. 1-551. London: William Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1923.

MR. WATTS'S task as a translator has been put to a severe test in the preparation of this volume, since its contents chiefly consist of Cicero's weakest speeches, viz. the four orations delivered after his return from exile. It cannot be denied that he has achieved considerable success. I take first a well-known passage from the *Pro Archia*, §§ 28-9, which is thus rendered:

'For magnanimity looks for no other recognition of its toils and dangers save praise and glory; once rob it of that, gentlemen, and in this brief and transitory pilgrimage of life what further incentive have we to high endeavour? If the soul were haunted by no presage of futurity, if the scope of her imaginings were bounded by the limits set to human existence, surely never then would she break herself by bitter toil, rack herself by sleepless solicitude, or struggle so often for very life itself. But deep in every noble

heart dwells a power which plies night and day the goad of glory, and bids us see to it that the remembrance of our names should not pass away with life, but should endure coeval with all the ages of the future.'

The translator's style does not desert him when he is dealing with less inspiring speeches, e.g. *Dom.* § 98:

'To undergo such deep grief of heart, and to endure in loneliness all the sufferings of the conquered inhabitants of a captured city that survives her capture; to see one's self torn from the clasp of one's kin, dwelling shattered, property plundered, and, bitterest of all, country forfeited for country's sake; to be deprived of the proudest bestowals of the Roman people, to be sent hurtling down from the pinnacle of majesty, to see foes in the garb of office demanding the funeral dues even before the lamentations for death have arisen; to endure to be a broken-hearted eyewitness of all this, in order to save the lives of compatriots, facing it not with the philosophy of those to whom nothing matters, but with the deep love for your dear ones and yourself which is imperative to our universal humanity;—this, indeed, is a glory transcending, nay, divine.'

Such passages may be read with pleasure by persons ignorant of Latin, while the Latin scholar will observe that the rendering is close and felicitous. There are, of course, many weaknesses and questionable renderings to be found in the volume, e.g. *Dom.* § 20, in eius regnum . . . patrociniū huius imperii immissis] 'you inflicted the patronage of this empire upon the realm'; § 69, flamma temporis] 'a piece of inflammatory opportunism'; *Har. Resp.* § 4, scelus . . . adulescentis furentis, nobilis] 'criminality . . . displayed by a maddened and exasperated young nobleman'; *Planc.* 95, lapidem e sepulchro venerari pro deo] 'giving divine honours to a piece of sepulchral masonry.' Sometimes modern slang is introduced: thus *Dom.* 14 we have 'a troupe of partisans, personally coached by yourself' and 'as if I . . . had made a corner in wheat.' The perpetual translation of *vir* as 'gentleman' in such phrases as *vir fortissimus* is irritating, while the horrible word 'proletariate' is sometimes used to render *plebs*.

In a prefatory note Mr. Watts says that in translating the speech *Pro Archia* and the four *Post Reditum* he has based his text upon that of Klotz in the Teubner edition (1866). In the *Pro Plancio* he has used Garatoni (Leipzig, 1824). He has also 'occasionally adopted emendations of Sir W.

Peterson in his Oxford Text,' recording such adoptions in the critical notes. The edition of Klotz has long been obsolete, having been superseded by Baiter-Halm and C. W. F. Müller, and it is most singular that it should have received this honour. An unfortunate consequence is that orthographical oddities are to be found: thus the form *quum* for *cum* survives sporadically, while *Planc.* § 26 we find *lacrymis* in the text and *lacrimis* in a note. The strangest point in the present volume, viz., the insertion of the speech *Pro Plancio* after those *Post Reditum*, while in all modern editions it occupies its proper chronological place after the *In Pisonem*, is based not on Klotz, but on more ancient texts. The prefatory note gives a list of MSS. used, but the reader is not told that they contain the *Post Reditum* speeches only. The critical notes are full of mistakes, e.g. *Planc.* 29, 'facilis MSS.: fragilis B: futilis Holden,' where for *B* should be read *Bake*, and for *Holden* should be substituted O. Müller. I notice with mingled feelings that an emendation of my own in *Planc.* 35, without the explanation which makes it possible, is ascribed to Peterson, while two others (§§ 59, 63) are printed in the text without any hint that the MSS. read otherwise.

ALBERT C. CLARK.

GRAMMATICAL REFORM.

Report of the American Joint Committee on Grammatical Nomenclature. Published by the National Education Association, Washington, D.C. Pp. 75. 25 cents.

THE final form of this report has just been issued, and the Committee is to be congratulated on the conclusion of its long labours (1911-23). The result is a very elaborate document, which goes more into detail than the report of the English Joint Committee, but is based on exactly the same principle, viz. that the terminologies employed in the teaching of the grammars of different languages, ancient and modern, should be unified in the interests alike of grammatical science and of practical

school work. Space forbids a discussion of this thorough bit of work in detail. But I will call attention to some salient points. The American report agrees with the English in adhering to the Parts of Speech—eight in number: it lends no countenance to the demand raised by certain members of the English Association in this country for the abandonment of this classification in favour of Jespersen's attempt at a new classification founded on what he calls a 'logical basis'—an attempt which I criticised last year (see *Proceedings of the Classical Association*, Vol. XX. 1923, pp. 35-44). It also agrees with the English Joint Committee in recommending the Latin

names (Nominative, Accusative, Dative, Genitive) for the case-uses of nouns and pronouns; but it distinguishes these from case-forms, of which it recognises only two, the 'genitive' and the 'common.' This strikes me as not very happy; for all case names in all languages are names of functions, not of forms, which are indeed so various that no terms could be found to describe them. In the treatment of the moods and tenses there is almost complete agreement between the two Joint Committees; thus the American report calls *essem* and the English 'were' past (not imperfect) subjunctives, and *fueram* and 'had been' past perfect (not pluperfect) indicatives. On the other hand, there are some points of divergence between the two Committees, which were only to be expected, considering that the national traditions had to be respected in both cases. What the American report aims at is to secure uniformity in the practice of *American* teachers; the English had the same object in view for the practice of *English* teachers. Neither Committee set out to provide a scheme which should be acceptable both in England and in America. For example the terms 'volition' and 'volitive' could hardly achieve currency in British class-rooms: we should prefer to speak of 'resolve,'

as more intelligible to school children. Again, the English Committee preferred 'prospective' to 'anticipatory' as simpler and shorter; there is no difficulty in speaking of an act as 'in prospect'; and it is not quite true, as is said on p. 33, that the English Committee 'while adopting *prospective* is obliged also to accept *anticipation*.' The word 'anticipation' occurs only once, in a statement where it might easily have been avoided (p. 34 of the English report), and there was no intention of recommending it for use. Another American term which we did not like was 'ideal certainty.' But it is by no means necessary that all countries should agree in their grammatical terminology: the objects of both the American and English Committees will have been attained if in each of these countries a single system of nomenclature is established. And we can congratulate them on the acceptance of their report by several important Associations in America (see pp. 66 f.), just as they congratulate us (p. x) on the endorsement of our report by the three Government Committees which were specially appointed to consider methods of teaching modern and ancient languages in British schools.

E. A. SONNENSCHNEIN.

A GREEK COMMENTARY ON THUCYDIDES.

Φῶς εἰς τὸ Θουκυδίδειον Ἔρεβος. Book

I. By K. A. LASKARIS. Pp. 138. Athens: Vartsos, 1922. 20 dr.

THIS is the first instalment of what the author hopes will be a complete (and quite original) commentary on Thucydides; and there is also to be one on Sophocles—truly a *πελώριον ἔργον*, as he tells us the Greek Minister for Education called it. But, to judge from this book, Mr. Laskaris is not adequately equipped for his task. His main object—he says so himself—is to show that modern scholars have seriously misunderstood a great number of passages in Thucydides, and to throw a little neo-Hellenic light on them; but the only commentaries with which he betrays first-hand acquaintance are

those of Herbst and Classen-Steup (edition of 1897); the names of Stahl, Croiset, Hude appear indeed in his pages, but all apparently, even Hude's, at second hand. He shows no knowledge of the relative value of the different MSS., nor of their grouping, nor of any of the papyrus fragments. He follows no principles of criticism, and so makes the wildest and most improbable conjectures; and he sometimes has strange ideas of what Thucydides could write. I must briefly support these statements.

I. I. ἀκμάζοντές τε ἦσαν ἐς αὐτόν. Mr. Laskaris says simply 'only two MSS. read ἦσαν, the rest ἦσαν,' without noticing that the two MSS. are F and the second hand of G (a rare and

perhaps significant combination), and that they are supported by a scholiast on the *Republic*, Photius, Suidas, and Zonaras; and he proposes to read *κατέστησαν*, with a host of quotations to prove that *καταστήναι* ἐς τὸν πόλεμον is possible Greek.

33. 3. *μηδὲ δνοῖν φθάσαι ἀμάρτωσιν, ἢ κακῶσαι ἡμᾶς ἢ σφᾶς αὐτοὺς βεβαιώσασθαι*. This is indeed a crux. Mr. Laskaris would read: *καὶ* [with the meaning of *μηδέ*] *δνοῖν ἀμάρτωσι, φθάσαι κακῶσαι ἡμᾶς καὶ ὑμᾶς αὐτοὺς μὴ βεβαιώσασθαι*. 'The corruption is easily seen to arise from a careless transposition of *φθάσαι* and of *μὴ* into the place of the lost *καί*. Then ἢ . . . ἢ is a later addition.'

40. 6. *εἰ γὰρ τοὺς κακὸν τι δρῶντας δέχομενοι τιμωρήσετε, κ.τ.λ.* He rightly rejects both the conjectures of Badham and Cobet, and Steup's proposal to transfer the whole paragraph to the end of c. 42. But he does not like the general form of the words *τοὺς κακὸν τι δρῶντας*, and demands something particularly and definitely referring to Corcyra; and proposes (what do you imagine?) *τούςδε τοὺς κακὸν ὅ τι ἐστὶ δρῶντας*.

In 103. 1 he would defend *δεκάτω* ἔτει on the sole ground that a siege of this duration is possible (Pausanias says the siege of Eira took eleven years), being quite ignorant of any other historical objection.

Yet there are some useful notes in the book and some fruitful suggestions, though perhaps none of his conjectures can be accepted as they stand. He is right in defending *δύο γὰρ ἄμα* ἐναντία ἀλλήλαις τοὺς λίθους ἐπὶ ἡγρον in 93. 5 as essential to the sentence; and there may be something in his view that the words *ὅπερ νῦν ἐτι δῆλόν ἐστι περὶ τὸν Πειραιᾶ* are the note of a much later antiquary, though the passage is not cured by merely omitting them (see, however, Harrison in *C.R.* XXVI. [1912], p. 248). In 25. 4 he would read *ἐν τοῖς τότε* for *ἔστιν ὅτε*; and the crux in 17 he would solve by writing (as I do not remember to have seen elsewhere): *εἰ μὴ εἴ τι τοῖς ἐν Σικελίᾳ, οὗτοι γὰρ ἐπὶ πλείστον ἐχώρησαν δυνάμεως, πρὸς περιόλους τοὺς αὐτῶν*. Alter the order and this may be on the right lines, though it does not accurately describe the achievements of Gelo and Hiero.

Doubtless it is difficult for a man living in Mytilene to remain in touch with current work. But in that case Mr. Laskaris might have been more modest and less dogmatic in his criticism of others, and have refrained from throwing mud at some of his countrymen for refusing his double application—for the publication of his two books, and for the chair of Ancient Literature at Athens.

A. W. GOMME.

WALKER'S *ADDENDA SCENICA*.

Addenda Scenica. By RICHARD JOHNSON WALKER, M.A. Pp. ix+611. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1923.

THIS book is, as its title implies, a miscellany. In a volume containing more than 600 pages, the first part (Papers I. and II.), extending to p. 320, is devoted to a detailed discussion of the Fragments ascribed to the Minor Tragedians, as recorded in Nauck's collection. To these the editor makes certain additions on his own account, but not so many as he appears to claim. Most of the so-called Additional Titles are recorded in Nauck's *Index Poetarum*, free from the clouds of wild guess-work in which Mr. Walker envelops them. The actual additions are Aristolochus

and Lysinus, taken from the Epistles of Phalaris, and Minyros and Aleuas, for whose existence as tragedians there is no evidence at all. Paper III. is entitled 'The Photian Indices to Stobaeus,' but does not mention the work of Elter; and, by an omission which must be described as amazing, Mr. Walker seems to neglect entirely the Wachsmuth-Hense edition of Stobaeus. If he refrains from using what should have been his chief authorities, he cannot be surprised if his efforts are not seriously regarded. Thus, if he had consulted Hense, who gives reasons for thinking that the extract quoted from Floril. II. 2 (Mein.) belongs to Bacchylides, he might have abstained

from his strange conjecture that the apparent lemma 'Ολυμπιάδος 'introduces the exordium of a hymn by Alexander the Great's mother Olympias, who is known to have been an ardent devotee of certain orgiastic mysteries.' Paper IV. deals with the catalogue of Aeschylus' plays preserved in the Medicean MS., and seeks to establish that the order is chronological in so far as it is not strictly alphabetical. It is strange that he makes no mention of the generally accepted view that the list originally contained the titles of ninety plays, and that one column of eighteen titles has been lost. Yet the fact, if established, nearly concerns Mr. Walker's thesis. Paper V. is entitled 'Marmor Albanum' (CIG. 3. 6047), and includes an account of the inscription known as the Marmor Piraeicum (CIA. ii. 992). Here also Mr. Walker essays to prove that the apparent disorder of the titles, arranged in part alphabetically and in part not, can be reduced to order if we assume that different types of plays are enumerated, and that within the limits of each type the principle of division was chronological. Here is one of his devices. The schol. on Ar. *Ran.* 67 records the production, after the death of Euripides, of three plays, 'Ἰφιγένειαν τὴν ἐν Αὐλίδι, 'Αλκμαίωνα, Βάκχας. But for 'Αλκμαίωνα the Venetus gives 'Αλκμαίω δίονα. One might suppose this a mere blunder of dittography with an intrusive *διο*. Not so Mr. Walker, who reads 'Αλκμαίω (accusative) · Δίοι α' (i.e. *ἐν*), Βάκχας. 'At the games of Dium one play, the *Bacchae*.' The treatment of the Marmor Piraeicum is still more startling. Previous scholars had conjectured that the list was part of a library catalogue. According to Mr. Walker the library belonged to the Bactrian consul, and the disturbance in the alphabetical order ceases when the names are transliterated into Sanskrit. Papers VI. and VII. bear the respective titles 'Dithyrambic Developments' and 'Sock and Buskin,' but they comprise such complex and disputable material that I will not attempt to summarise it.

Those who know Mr. Walker's previous works will know what to expect from this book, and they will not be disappointed. Mr. Walker is

learned and ingenious, but these qualities are rendered nugatory by hasty conclusions and a recklessness of conjecture which is almost incredible. The strangeness of his proceedings is all the more remarkable because he is perfectly well aware that the evidence on which he relies is frequently inadequate. Hence he seeks to disarm criticism by pleading that, though his results are uncertain, they cannot be proved impossible. Let us see how Mr. Walker obtains some of his results; for while he often strains at a gnat and swallows a camel, he constantly builds one hypothesis upon another to the utter confusion of his readers. The Argument of the *Agamemnon* was in its essentials strikingly confirmed by an inscription found on the Acropolis in 1886; and the production of the *Oresteia* at the City Dionysia of 458 may be regarded as one of the best attested facts in the dramatic records. There is, however, a flaw in the words 'Ολυμπιάδι κῆ' ἔτει δευτέρῳ, which is usually mended by the substitution of π' for κῆ'. This is not subtle enough for Mr. Walker, who prefers to suppose that the drama was staged in the archonship of Philocles at the 28th Greater Panathenaea. In this connexion he builds up an extraordinary theory that tragedies were never performed at the City Dionysia in the second year of an Olympiad, but always at the Panathenaea. The remark on p. 306 that *contrary to custom* (my italics) the inscription does not name the second and third competitors would not have been made if Mr. Walker had examined the series of records. Examples like the above must not be thought exceptional; for the reader, as he turns over the pages of this book, will find no lack of disputable matter. What are we to say of the adjective *χλανίδιος*, invented because Mr. Walker (unlike Hesychius) found the phrase *κατήρη χλανίδιους* (Eur. *Suppl.* 110) intolerable? Or take this. Having in a previous volume reconstructed the Hesychian gloss *ἀναξίαν βασιλείαν Διοχύλος λιανοταίς* (fr. 283) as *Διοχύλος ἰδ' ἀνοταίς* ('A. in the Fourteen Follies'), he regards the schol. on Eur. *Phoen.* 1031 *τὴν Σφίγγα ὁ Διώνυσος ἔπεμψε τοῖς Θηβαίοις ὡς ἐναντοία λέγειν* as confirming his conjecture, and for

the last words substitutes *ἐν ἀνοίᾳ λέγει* with the comment 'This particular Folly of Euripides was evidently called the *Sphinx*.' Among the shadowy forms which play their parts in this strange game, not the least astonishing is the *Criterion*, a tragedy assigned to Euripides junior with a plot including the Judgement of Paris. The inwardness of this statement will not be apparent to the reader until he discovers from Critias fr. 4 N. that *κριτηρίον* is probably a blunder for *Κριτίου*.

I will confess that I cannot swallow Mr. Walker otherwise than in small doses. In the last two essays, when he begins to make play with *atheta* and with *quarta quae*, with *comico-satyrice*, *tragoediae solemnes*, *quasi-satyrice*, and the rest of the queer company, my head begins to reel: so many are the assumptions which, as it seems to me, are groundless and improbable, and so extraordinary are the results with which he fills the gaps in our literary records.

A. C. PEARSON.

OUR DEBT TO CICERO.

Cicero and his Influence. ('Our Debt to Greece and Rome.') By JOHN C. ROLFE, Ph.D. Pp. vii + 178. London: Harrap and Co., 1923. 10s.

THIS book is good, though in some respects disappointing. That Dr. Rolfe is well qualified to write on Cicero is obvious: in this volume he gives us a clear and sympathetic sketch of the man, discusses shortly his political views, appraises his eloquence, and ends by considering his influence in ancient and modern times. So far, so good. But unfortunately the title of the series in which the book is published compels him too frequently to draw 'lessons' or point to conclusions which the intelligent reader should be allowed to grasp himself; instances will be found on pp. 35, 48, 59, 163 and 168. Nor is a reader likely to be impressed (*à propos* of the tale of Augustus finding his grandson reading Cicero) by the suggestion that 'Only the cinema could do the scene full justice, with a "close-up" of Augustus, his handsome face "registering" deep thought' . . . ; and to say that 'Cicero delivered four orations against' the law of Rullus (p. 42), or that 'in Cicero's Rome the control of the government had fallen into the hands of a body of highly trained men' (p. 17), or to speak of Cicero's 'Origins' (p. 118), is misleading. These, however, are minor slips. But I could wish that, by abbreviating the chapters on Cicero's 'influence,' Dr. Rolfe could have told us more of Cicero's political ideas—('De Re Publica' is dismissed in a few lines, p. 95)—of his sense of Empire; of his feeling for the pro-

vincials, which stands out in a sharp contrast to the apathy or rapacity of his contemporaries; of his efforts at good administration, and of the difficulties therein encountered. By so doing he would have revealed a side of Cicero's public life which merits more attention than it usually gets, would have completed the picture of Cicero's character, and would have left the reader in a position to draw his own conclusions. For after all the question of Cicero's influence belongs more to the history of scholarship. Politian, Cortesi, Bembo, and Erasmus may still be wrangling in Elysium, but, as Dr. Rolfe remarks, 'if in this year of grace Cicero's influence is less obvious than it has been at some previous time, it is because it has been absorbed and assimilated by our modern life and forms an essential part of it, affecting our best literary style and ideals, our manners and morals, in fact our entire civilisation.' This is true, and well said. It is impossible to prove such an elusive thing as 'influence' by an array of statistics or by marshalling names. But perhaps it is unfair to blame Dr. Rolfe: the very title of the series encourages this, as Dr. Mackail has pointed out in the May-June number of the *Classical Review*.

This book may not add much to our knowledge of Cicero—at present that is scarcely possible—but it does give a true and generous picture of the great Roman, without glozing over his faults or over-emphasising his weaknesses.

M. P. CHARLESWORTH.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN THE ATHENIAN EMPIRE.

The Administration of Justice in the Athenian Empire. By H. GRANT ROBERTSON. One vol. Pp. 89. University of Toronto, 1924. \$1.00.

THIS volume, which carries on the series of classical monographs by scholars of Toronto University, is chiefly concerned to explain the principles on which judicial cases were shared out between the courts of Athens and of her allies in the Confederacy of Delos. Since the documentary evidence on this subject is neither copious nor clear, the author, like all his predecessors in this quest, is mostly reduced to a balancing of probabilities in his conclusions. In this delicate task he has exercised a wise discretion, and on many points of detail his account is to be preferred to that of Gilbert's well-known handbook. In particular, he performs a useful service in drawing a sharp line of distinction between *δίκαι ἀπὸ ξυμβολῶν* and political trials, which never came under the same set of rules.

Mr. Robertson at times leans rather heavily upon texts of doubtful value. In his elucidation of *δίκαι ἀπὸ ξυμβολῶν* he makes free use of §§11-13 of the speech De Halonneso, although this passage is highly confused and perhaps deliberately confusing. He accepts a story in Athenaeus to the

effect that Alcibiades without official sanction expunged a case from the docket of an Athenian court. This anecdote follows upon another yarn which is demonstrably false, and the complete absence of references to the incident among earlier authors makes it suspect. Again, the Lexicon Seguerianum, s.v. *κρυπτή*, hardly suffices to prove the existence of a secret police at Athens. This *κρυπτή*, according to the Lexicon, was executive as well as inquisitorial: in all probability we have here our old friend the Spartan *κρυπτεία*. Lastly, the reading *[δί]κας διδόν[τε]ς πρὸς Ἀθην[αίων τοὺς ἐπισκόπους]* in a document from Mitylene, which Mr. Robertson makes much use of, is of doubtful value, and by no means suffices to prove the existence of *ἐπίσκοποι* at Mitylene.

The only other point for criticism is that Mr. Robertson hardly allows for changes in Athenian policy as the making of it passed from Cimon to Pericles and to Cleon. His strictures upon Athenian imperialism, though fundamentally just, therefore may need some qualification.

Taken as a whole, Mr. Robertson's treatise is a careful piece of scholarship, and is well worth study by those who wish to learn the details of Athenian administration.

M. CARY.

THE BUDE PLATO.

Platon : Oeuvres Complètes. Tome III., 1^{re} partie: Protagoras; texte établi et traduit par ALFRED CROISSET et LOUIS BODIN. Vol. I. 8vo. Pp. 19+132. Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1923. 9 fr.

THIS translation of the *Protagoras* maintains a distinguished level of scholarship and literary skill: it accordingly repays, as well as invites, a careful reading. It brings out well the force and brilliance of a conversation which is one of Plato's highest feats in dramatic description, and contrives on the whole to keep faithfully to the track and shirk no peaks or thickets of idiom. This standard of thoroughness makes one wonder the more at an occasional skip or slide like the following: 311 B—

'Je voulus tâter Hippocrate . . . pour voir le fond de sa pensée,' for *καὶ ἐγὼ ἀποπειρώμενος τοῦ Ἱπποκράτους τῆς ῥώμης διεσκόπουν αὐτὸν* ('to test his grit I began examining him'); 314 C—'un propos commencé au long du chemin,' for *λόγου . . . ὃς ἡμῖν κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ἐνέπεσεν*: 315 C—'prononçait des arrêts et dissertait,' for *διέκρινεν καὶ διεξήγει* (Hippias was 'distinguishing and expounding' the questions put to him); 323 C—'fruit du hasard . . . effet du hasard,' for *ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτομάτου . . . τύχη*: 360 D—'Il en convint,' for *ἐπένευσεν* (where a silent unwilling *nod* must be intended); and it is to be hoped that the 'ordinary reader' in France is quite clear about 'un épistate, un prytane' (338 A).

The text rightly admits only a few modern conjectures, yet Stahl's *ἐπίστασθαι* for *ἐπίσταται* in 312 E, and Baiter's *ὄνυξι* for *θριξί* in 321 B seem almost necessary. On the other hand, there is hardly good enough reason for expelling, with Sauppe, *δι' Ἐπιμηθέα* and, with Deuschle, *διὰ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ συγγένειαν* in 322 A; or, with Schanz, *τὰ ἕτερα τῶν ἑτέρων* in 329 D.

The Introduction provides a brief and lucid account of the characters, construction, and philosophic interest of the dialogue. It insists, perhaps a little too strongly, on the artistic motive for the composition, regarding the thought as a rather crude preliminary to the main thesis of the *Republic*. Perhaps also the modern impulse to give Protagoras his due as an intelligent educator tends here to a certain exaggeration of his mental claims. Plato does indeed keep the First Professor's head well above water, and furnishes it with much good sense as well as knowledge; while Socrates' sham exposition of Simonides is a

scholastic joke that can only be excused by imagining him to be in his twenties rather than—as he really was—in his thirties. Plato conceives him, in fact, as a youth: but the contrast of ages only makes his young hero's serious attack the more striking and significant in its whole revolutionary effect.

The volume is pleasantly printed on good thick paper: a dropped or wrong letter here and there shows that the proofs have not been very carefully revised. The numeration of Stephanus is wisely placed at the top of each page, so that we always know where we are; but frequently there is a difference of several lines between text and translation at the turnover. Worse still, the notes—which are all useful and good—begin on one French page and mostly run over to the next French page, so that hardly ever can they be read without turning once to finish them, and then turning back to proceed with the story. There is no index.

W. R. M. LAMB.

Platon. Oeuvres Complètes, tome III., 2^e partie; *Gorgias*, Ménon. Texte établi et traduit par ALFRED CROISSET et LOUIS BODIN; tome VIII., 1^{re} partie; *Parménide*. Texte établi et traduit par AUGUSTE DIÈS. Two vols. 8vo. Pp. (i) 23+324; (ii) 65+122. Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1923. (i) 16 fr.; (ii) 10 fr.

THESE two volumes of the 'Budé' Plato maintain the general excellence of their predecessors. The *Gorgias* is provided with a remarkably good introduction, in which the subject, the characters, the construction and the style are briefly and attractively set forth; the account given of Athenian rhetoric, and of Plato's attitude towards it in the *Gorgias*, is admirable, and the peculiar religious tone of his exaltation of philosophy is just sufficiently indicated; but there should be some reference to its probable connection with the foundation of the Academy. There is, in particular, a masterly paragraph on the fine spiritual force of Socrates' unadorned style of eloquence. The text is conservative, with the single exception of *Νόμος* . . . *ἀγεῖν δικαιοὶ τὸ βλαύσαντων* (for *ἀγεῖ δικαίων*, 484 B, suggested by *Larus* 715 A, *ἐφαμέν πον* . . . *τὸν Πινδαρον ἀγεῖν δικαιοῦντα τὸ βλαύσαντων*), which seems satisfactory. The translation adds a little colour here and there to a phrase, especially in some of the short replies of the person interrogated, but is otherwise very faithful, and reproduces much of the vigour and grace of the original. The *Meno* might perhaps have had a little fuller treatment in its introduction, but the

general purport is well stated. In the translation, it is not easy to follow the discussion at 84-85, or again at 87 A, without a diagram; we are given none at either place.

VOLUME VIII. of this Plato, of which the first part containing the *Parmenides* is now published, is to be completed with the *Theaetetus* and the *Sophist*; another volume will contain the *Politicus* and the *Philebus*. A short general introduction, prefixed to Volume VIII., deals with this whole series of dialogues; it discusses rather the external evidences of their genuineness, sequence and interconnection than their philosophic content, but makes some admirable remarks on their dramatic and literary merits. The *Parmenides*, to sixty pages of translation, has the unusual allowance of fifty pages for its special introduction, which will take a creditable place, on account of its orderly method and attractive style, in the real literature of the subject. After quoting at some length (two pages) from the poem of Parmenides, it points out the importance, not only of Zeno, but of Gorgias, to the development of the amazing critical energy which Plato displayed in the *Parmenides*. It then gives a useful outline of the arguments, and in discussing them dwells on their purpose and value as preparatory exercises, without professing to educe any distinct meaning from their results. The text admits a few modern corrections of minor importance; the *apparatus* is a full one, and pays great attention to the variants of Proclus. The notes are few, but are always helpful and interesting. It is a

pity that, like those in the other volumes of the series, they almost always run over to the next French page (the next but one), so that we have to turn over, and then turn back, before we can proceed with the main business.

W. R. H. LAMB.

Platon: Oeuvres Complètes. Tome VIII., 2^e Partie: Théétète. Texte établi et traduit par AUGUSTE DIÈS. Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1924. Pp. 36+214. 12 francs.

THE eighth volume of this excellent version of Plato fully maintains in this second part, which contains the *Theaetetus*, the high level of the *Parmenides* in the first part, and prompts happy anticipations of the *Sophist* in the third. The Introduction deals in turn with the characters, the subject-matter and the text, and takes full and fair account of the most valuable modern discussions of each, without straying into any length of controversy. The translation is always careful to extract the full meaning of the thought in its various turns and refinements, and succeeds in reproducing a fair measure both of the personal tones of the talk and of the strenuous vigour of the reasoning. The claims of completeness occasionally lead to a loss of crispness, as when the opening words—'Ἀπρί, ὦ Τερψίων, ἡ πάλα ἐξ ἀγροῦ;—are spread out into—'Ne fais-tu qu'arriver de la campagne, Terpsion? Ou bien y a-t-il longtemps que tu es de retour?' The famous phrase of Socrates about *Parmenides* that 'he had a kind of depth that was altogether noble' (βάθος τι ἔχειν παντάπασι γενναίων, 183E) is rather oddly rendered 'avoir des profondeurs absolument sublimes.' But these are but one or two specks in a finely wrought mirror which is a work of the highest credit to the scholarship and literary art of France. The text offers only two or three slight departures from the received construction of the manuscript and other ancient evidence, the variations of which are clearly stated in the *apparatus*.

W. R. M. LAMB.

Xenophon, *Anabasis*, Books IV.-VII., with an English translation by CARLETON L. BROWNSON; and *Symposium and Apology*, with an English translation by O. J. TODD. (Loeb Classical Library.) 6½" x 4½". One vol. Pp. 521. London: Heinemann, 1922. 10s.

Xenophon, *Memorabilia and Oeconomicus*, with an English translation by E. C. MARCHANT. (Loeb Classical Library.) 6½" x 4½". One vol. Pp. xxix+532. London: Heinemann, 1923. 10s.

TRANSLATORS of Xenophon court comparison with Dakyns. His work was done with gusto and with humour; but he carried informality too far, and his whimsical touches are alien to the Greek. Mr. Brownson has completed his *Anabasis* in a plain, workmanlike style, well suited to its purpose. Mr. Todd is less successful with the *Symposium* and *Apology*; in dialogue especially his English is cumbersome.

Mr. Marchant is as idiomatic in vocabulary and structure of sentence as Dakyns, but more simple and terse—truly Attic English; he has made an admirable book.

Ethical terms are a problem for translators; Mr. Marchant mostly varies their renderings with the context, but in *Memorabilia* keeps to 'prudence' for σωφροσύνη—surely a doubtful equivalent, which indeed he abandons at *Oec.* 7. 14. 'My duty, as my mother told me, is to be discreet' (σωφρονεῖν). 'Trooper' can hardly be right for ὅπλιτης. It may be doubted if τὰ φαλάγγια . . . προσσφάμενα μόνον τῷ στόματι (*Mem.* 1. 3. 12) means 'the scorpion, if it but fasten on the tongue,' or ἔργον ἀποδείξασθαι (*Mem.* 4. 7. 2) 'compute the yield' of a piece of ground.

The introduction dissects the *Memorabilia* acutely; its parts are really separate works. The view that Socrates originated the Theory of Ideas is pronounced 'to say the least extremely doubtful,' and in any case incompatible with the relativity of beauty and goodness which was the Socratic doctrine according to the *Memorabilia* and which appears in *Gorgias* unchallenged. *Oeconomicus* was prized by Ruskin, largely, one suspects, because Ischomachus and his girl-bride appealed to the early-Victorian brand of feminism. In this methodical gentleman, and 'that long-suffering little saint,' Mr. Marchant sees the author himself and his wife Phileasia: 'this regimental order in his house is the mirror of Xenophon's mind, for his mind is a series of labelled pigeon-holes, each hole filled with a commonplace thought remorselessly analysed.'

H. RACKHAM.

Le Latin: Dix Causeries. By J. MAROUZEAU.

One vol. 8vo. Pp. 278. Paris: H. Didier; Toulouse: E. Privat, 1923.

IN this brisk and stimulating little book M. Marouzeau has published ten popular lectures, originally delivered to the upper classes of the Collège Sévigné in Paris, and now dedicated to his former pupils. The 'forme orale' of the 'causeries,' which is retained throughout, is so lively and direct that we can almost hear the author addressing us in his vigorous, and often colloquial, French. The lectures deal with many different aspects of Latin. The first is mainly concerned with the proper attitude, both of the teacher and of the pupil, towards the study of Latin. With regard to the teacher, M. Marouzeau never tires in insisting on the need of making the ancient world in all its aspects live again in the classroom. To the pupils he says: 'Soyez curieux. Interrogez les textes. Ayez des impressions, des surprises. Étonnez-vous. . . Ouvrez sur le monde des mots des yeux neufs et naïfs, et vous verrez, si l'on sait bien vous éclairer la route, s'animer, se colorer et vivre cette vieille langue morte que la science ressuscite.' The spirit of this last sentence animates the 'causeries' which follow. The second discusses the spelling and pronunciation of Latin; M. Marouzeau is emphatic on the need for reform of the latter very much

on the lines of the reformed pronunciation advocated by the Classical Association. Succeeding chapters deal with Latin texts and manuscripts, Roman life as revealed by Latin authors, the origin and history of the Latin language, and Latin style. The author concludes with an interesting demonstration entitled 'exercice pratique: comment lire un texte,' in which he translates and analyses the beginning of Horace, *Satires*, I. 9 and tries to make Horace's terrible encounter a living experience for us too. Clearly there is room for reform in the teaching of Latin in France, and M. Marouzeau is a tireless and skilful advocate. We need not take offence if in so good a cause he is at times carried away by his enthusiasm and tends to exaggerate. Though most of M. Marouzeau's informative matter is already contained in textbooks, few teachers and still fewer students of Latin will read *Le Latin* without deriving profit both from the clear presentation of the facts and from the author's bracing personality. A good feature is the very serviceable bibliography, intended primarily for French readers, which follows each 'causerie'; but there is no index verborum. A few misprints may puzzle beginners, e.g. D = 50 (p. 46), *quostiens* for *quotiens* (p. 52). English readers will be surprised to find Tsizeur (p. 43), and Mâbre (p. 57) as phonetic equivalents of Caesar (English pronunciation) and Marlborough. In his philological chapters M. Marouzeau, though generally sound, is not always accurate in details—e.g. *Oscan fatium* (p. 157) is generally regarded as = Latin *fateri* (i.e. *fari*), not *facere*; -r in passive and deponent forms is not confined to Latin and Celtic (as implied on p. 162); the formation of the Latin future and imperfect in -bo and -bam hardly 'se comprend' without further explanation than is given (p. 170), etc. The short paragraph on Roman personal names (p. 148) is very inexact, and the reader must be on his guard against other inaccuracies, which, however, do not seriously affect the author's main purpose.

G. E. K. BRAUNHOLTZ.

Les Inscriptions Romaines: Bibliographie pratique. Par L. PERRET, avec une préface de R. CAGNAT. One vol. 12mo. Pp. 42. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1924. 2 fr. 50 c.

THIS little brochure is a practical guide for beginners in Roman Epigraphy, supplying them with (1) information, complementary to the bibliography in Cagnat's *Cours* (fourth edition), about the large collections of inscriptions (including *Inscr. Graecae ad res Rom. pertinentes*), provisional collections, Dessau's selection, etc., and the ground covered by each volume; (2) practical hints how to find their way about *C.I.L.*, where indexed or as yet indexless, and a bibliography of the principal aids to the interpretation of epigraphic texts. The work is well done.

J. G. C. ANDERSON.

Les Divisions administratives de l'Espagne romaine. Par E. ALBERTINI. 10" x 6½". One vol. Pp. vii + 138, with one Map. Paris: E. de Boccard, 1923.

THIS excellent study covers the period of Roman rule in Spain, the last stages of which are treated with more than usual fulness. Not unnaturally, the author sometimes finds himself disagreeing with current views, which rest substantially on the work of Mommsen and Hübner. It is the inevitable fate of great constructive work on a large scale, like that of Mommsen, to become, to no small extent, a *corpus vile*: much of it is bound to be provisional synthesis, which requires verification and correction; but the fact that it is the starting-point of later enquiries is the measure of its value. M. Albertini finds that the Roman administration of Spain was less uniform and rigid than Mommsen, with his juristic outlook, represented it: it was rather a practical adaptation of measures to circumstances varying with the times. The salient feature of pre-Roman Spain, resulting from the joint action of geographical conditions and immigrant influences, was the lack of unity and even of large divisions closely knit by political organisation and uniform culture. The establishment of two Roman provinces followed naturally from the existence of two zones of occupation widely separated by a mountainous tract, and the ultimate delimitation represented in the main the further annexations made from each base: between the two, in the north, lay the unconquered Astures and Cantabri. In 27 B.C. Augustus created three provinces by separating the more civilised southern part of the further province from the northern. So say our ancient authorities, and though their accuracy has been impugned from Mommsen onwards, they are rightly defended by M. Albertini. The boundaries of these provinces, however, were modified later by Augustus: in the end, between 7 and 3½ B.C., the three difficult districts of the north-west and a disturbed strip of Baetica were put under the control of the governor of Hither Spain, in whose hands the military forces were concentrated.

On the provincial subdivisions M. Albertini has a new view, which seems sound. The doctrine of the 'dioceses' of Hither Spain (based on Strabo and current in some form since Mommsen) he casts aside, and holds that the districts in question did not co-exist with the *conventus*, but were replaced by them from Claudius' reign, when military considerations ceased to be dominant. In dealing with the *conventus*, he points out that they came to form real units, midway between province and *civitas*, through the permanence of the relations, judicial, economic, and religious, which they created. An interesting chapter discusses the relation between the Roman and the native divisions, and rejects, as a distortion of the facts, Mommsen's view that Rome pursued a deliberate policy of breaking up the Spanish cantons. Large, coherent cantons there never were in Spain: physical conditions stood in the way, favouring a local spirit and clan feeling (*gentilitas*). On the contrary, Rome gave to

the *regio*, and thereby to the *gens*, a real meaning and a practical importance they had never had, and overcame for a time the natural tendency that drives Spain to division and has made the unification of the country both slow and precarious. Altogether an interesting and lucid book.

J. G. C. ANDERSON.

Tacitus' Germania. Erläutert von H. SCHWEIZER-SIDLER; erneuert von E. SCHWYZER. Eighth Edition. One vol. Large 8vo. Pp. xiv+165, with six illustrations and a map. Halle (a.d. S.): Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1923. Grundpreis 4 marks.

PROFESSOR SCHWYZER has published a third edition of his valuable commentary on the *Germania*, which first appeared as a revision of the fifth issue of his great-uncle's edition, but has become substantially an independent work. The great merit of the earlier editions lay in the very full use that was made of the results of historical (including ethnological) and archaeological inquiry to explain and illustrate the statements of Tacitus. In the third edition the commentary and the second appendix have been expanded, and a third appendix has been added. The second appendix contains a detailed citation of the literature dealing with the many subjects raised by the *Germania*, and some critical discussions; the third collects and prints *in extenso* evidence from other ancient sources about Germany and the Germans. These changes enhance the value of a work which scholars have recognised as an indispensable aid to the study of Tacitus' monograph.

The commentary, if lengthy, is comprehensive. It is not only full on the historical side, but it also pays minute attention to the interpretation of the Latin, though usually without much (if any) argument and mostly without mention of other views. This is to be regretted, since the interpretations adopted do not always command assent. We may instance the following: c. 2 *fin.*, *a victore . . . a se ipsis . . . Germani vocarentur*, where *a* is explained 'von—aus,' 'mit Rücksicht auf,' and the whole interpretation is forced; c. 5 *init.*, *specie (differt)*, 'im einzelnen'; c. 11, *sic constituunt, sic condicunt*, 'erg. diem: constituere heisst "einen Termin festsetzen," condicere denselben "annehmen, zusagen"'; c. 30 *fin.*, *velocitas* ('der chattischen Reiterei'); c. 33 *fin.*, *quando urgentibus imperii fatis*, etc. = 'imperii fatis (Dat. zu praestare) quae id (imperium) iam urgent,' for which the only argument is that, if *urg. fatis* is taken as abl. abs., *imperii* instead of *imperium* is 'störend.' Two observations may be added on historical points: in the commentary on *vidimus sub divo Vesp. Velelam* (c. 8) we have no mention of the fact that the capture of the prophetess took place in A.D. 77-78 in the course of Rutilius Gallicus' campaign against the Bructeri, and in c. 29 we find that Tacitus' statement about the immigration of *levissimus quisque Gallorum* into the Agri Decumates is accepted without question.

The printing of the volume, no light task, is excellently done: misprints, such as *populus* for *populos* in the text of c. 1 and *la concretum* in c. 23, note, are rare. But the paper used is of an inferior quality.

J. G. C. ANDERSON.

Das Schicksal als poetische Idee bei Homer. Von Dr. P. ENGELBERT EBERHARD (*Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums*, XIII. Band, 1. Heft). One vol. 8½" × 5½". Pp. 80. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1923.

THE author is a disciple of Roemer and Drerup, the leaders of that recent unitarian movement by which all seeming inconsistencies within the Homeric poems are imputed to the artistic needs of the poet. Many disharmonies may indeed be so resolved, and with his fellows Dr. Eberhard has done good service in revealing or emphasising the organic interdependence of various parts in each whole; but, with them also, he goes too far. Elements that seem incompatible in Homer's world may coexist in Homer's mind and art—to justify this position, the poet must be conceived as absolutely detached from not only the material conditions, but also the spiritual concepts of his age, able to archaïse as much in the attitude of his heroes towards life as in the fashion of their armour. Drerup maintains that the 'Götterapparat'—the word is significant: Roemer uses 'Göttermaschine'—of the epics serves primarily not religious but 'poetisch-technisch' ends. In the spirit of a twentieth-century sceptic, it seems, the poet employed now the religious notions current in his own age, now those of an age past, just as suited the particular incident of the plot. The fact that he had a high degree of material civilisation and probably an epic tradition behind him will not explain such detachment and freedom of treatment. Centuries later, when the Ionic spirit of criticism had run its course, the Attic tragedians scarcely went so far. More than this, such change and inconsistency within a work is simply bad art, above all when it is for the most part conscious, as its defenders imply. The suggestion is strange indeed, coming from the professedly 'aesthetic' champions of Homer.

The problem of Fate in the poems, its nature and relation to the gods, is well stated, and the various existing solutions are reviewed and rejected. Alike those who place *μοῖρα* above the gods and those who regard it as subordinate to, or identical with, the divine will, can be refuted by conflicting instances. The critics who, facing the difficulty, take the easy line of admitting manifold authorship and a developing concept, are ruled out by unitarian considerations. Dr. Eberhard's own solution is given by the title. Homer uses *μοῖρα* as 'poetische Idee.' It is a 'technisches Hilfsmittel,' representing the poet's plan of what is going to happen, or 'the poet's better knowledge' as opposed to that of his heroes. No hint is given, however, what the attitude of the latter inside the poems must be supposed to

be. When Zeus contemplates saving Hector, Athene reminds him that Hector is *πάλαι πεπρωμένον αἶσῃ* (II. XXII. 179), and he yields. Is she appealing to the poet's plan, and, though he might 'doom men to death to furnish theme for song in aftertime,' was Zeus here looking quite so far ahead? It is obvious indeed in the poems themselves, that there is a very real fatalism of some kind abroad. Naturally the course of the plot almost always coincides with *μοῖρα*, since *μοῖρα* is almost always fulfilled. It is this which gives the theory what verisimilitude it has. When, however, the poem alludes to incidents outside the plot, e.g. Achilles' fated early death, Dr. Eberhard shifts his ground; *μοῖρα* is no longer the poet's plan but the saga tradition, to which he must conform. Sarpedon's death, on the other hand, is, we are told, described as fated, because the poet's plan requires it to prepare the way for Hector's vengeance on Patroclus and the ensuing triumph of Achilles. Here he speaks as if the poet were constructing an ingenious fiction, instead of following a tradition where that was the natural and actual sequence. It is, however, where *μοῖρα* is not fulfilled that the theory most completely breaks down. In II. XVI. 780 *καὶ τότε δὴ ὅππῃ αἶσαν Ἀχαιοὶ φέρτεροι ἦσαν*, we are told that *ὑπὲρ αἶσαν* means 'against the main line of the poet's plan,' yet this last means not the general issue, wherein also the Achaeans were victorious, but the death of Patroclus which immediately follows. The still more difficult passage, *Od. I. 32-36*, is discreetly reserved to a discussion of Homer's own views on fate, which, it is naively suggested, sometimes creep in. Zeus says 'Ἀΐγισθος ὑπὲρ μῶρον Ἀρτεΐδαο | γῆμ' ἄλοχον μνηστήν.' The poet's plan or tradition can have no part here, yet no adequate alternative is provided. These defects and inconsistencies show that Dr. Eberhard's theory is no better than its predecessors. There are some difficulties which even the vagaries of a poet in his art will not explain. Indeed, multiple authorship may be a simpler solution.

R. B. ONIANS.

Griechische und Griechisch-Demotische Ostraka der Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek zu Strassburg im Elsass. Herausgegeben von PAUL VIERECK. Mit Beiträgen von WILHELM SPIEGELBERG. Band I.: Texte. Octavo. Pp. xv + 356. Berlin: Weidmann, 1923.

THE production of this volume has been attended by some difficulties. It was commenced before the war, but was delayed by that event, and the loss of Strassburg has prevented the verification of many subsequent conjectures, such as always suggest themselves to an editor of texts like these. But Viereck is a good decipherer, and though there are not a few passages where further revision might prove fruitful, the texts in general can no doubt be relied on.

Ostraca are as a rule more informative than interesting; for the scanty space available restricted their use to documents of the briefer

and more formal kinds, and in the present collection, as in others, tax-receipts figure largely. But if such texts are unattractive to others than specialists, they are often of great value for economic history, besides containing much incidental evidence on nomenclature, chronology, etc., and this volume makes welcome additions to our material. It is true that for handy use a commentary is required, and the commentary on these texts (except for notes on readings) is reserved for a further volume, which is only too likely to be delayed; but the evidence itself is here and can be extracted by the student, the more easily because there are excellent indexes. Of the quality of the editorial work it is hardly necessary to speak to those who know Professor Viereck's publications.

In the matter of general interest the later sections are superior to the first, which contains tax-receipts, arranged according to their formulae. Among these later sections D (accounts) is specially worthy of mention. It contains some good metrological material, several new or unusual words, and an interesting series of agricultural accounts. Section E (miscellaneous) includes one or two good letters, two theological and two astrological texts, and a few other documents of some value.

It is much to be hoped that the commentary, which Viereck is so well qualified to write, will follow speedily. In the meantime we must be grateful for the careful and laborious work which has gone to the production of this volume. There are a certain number of misprints, in part corrected in the Addenda. In 100. 1 should *Λμ* really be *λα[οργ(αφίς)]* (*ὑπὲρ* omitted)? For *Παμώθης* = *Παμώνθης* as Spiegelberg suggests (102. 1) reference might be made to the variants *Κωσταντίνος*, *Κώστανς* for *Κωνστ.* in later times. In 512. 5 the occurrence of *modii* suggests grain; qu. *κριθῶν*? In 516. 4 is *ἐκασέπτορι* possible? In 795. 5 *τριμεισιν* = *τριμήσιον* (*tremissis*) seems highly probable (P. M. Meyer, less plausibly, suggests *trimensem*.)

H. I. BELL.

Three Measures of Meal. By FRANK G. VIAL, B.D., Professor of Pastoral Theology, Lennoxville, Canada. London: Oxford University Press, 1923. 10s. 6d.

THIS book applies the Parable of the Leaven to the early Christian centuries, the leaven representing Christ, 'the vital force,' the three measures of meal representing the Hebrew, the Greek, and the Roman constituents, which, by the vital force, were transformed into the vigorous church which created the Christian world. The writer recognises that each of these three constituents modified the Christian message in some degree, but he regards the transformation of the three types of meal by the vital force as being of infinitely more significance than any debilitating influence they may have exercised. The materials laid before us by the writer are not new but drawn from the great works of classical and Christian scholarship; yet the viewing of these masses of carefully

selected facts as preparation for the vital force or as results of its action is illuminating and very impressive. The volume is thus of real practical value, even if some of its contentions should finally prove untenable.

The study of the religious genius of Israel and of the forces which prepared the people for the Leaven during the three foregoing centuries is vivid and convincing. The Synagogue, Pharisaism, Apocalyptic, on the one hand, and Hellenism, the Septuagint and the Wisdom Literature, on the other, are each shown in their direct action on the religious mind created by the Law and the Prophets.

The presentation of the Greek constituent is the section which captures the reader most forcibly. It closes with a striking study of Paul, fundamentally Semitic, yet sufficiently Hellenised to become, when completely leavened, the bridge between the Hebrew Church and the rest of the world.

The Roman section is less convincing and would leave us cold, were it not for the writer's intense interest in worship, organisation and discipline.

The book necessarily suggests at many points the question how the theory of the supreme potency and spiritual value of the Vital Force would emerge from a sympathetic comparison of this Christian history with the growth and spread of Buddhism, on the one hand, and of Islam, on the other.

J. N. FARQUHAR.

Horace at Tibur and the Sabine Farm. By G. H. HALLAM. Pp. 24; 11 illustrations and two maps. Harrow School Bookshop, J. F. Moore, 1923.

IN December 1922 Mr. Hallam gave a lecture with lantern slides in London on 'Horace and his two homes in the Sabines and at Tibur.' This lecture was given again in April 1923 at Tivoli without lantern slides, and therefore with some necessary modifications. His little book, *Horace at Tibur and the Sabine Farm*, contains this modified lecture, together with several illustrations and two useful maps. In his preface Mr. Hallam tells us that his set of lantern slides, with his lecture or 'talk' descriptive of them, was one of the first to be prepared for a series of lantern lectures on Classical subjects to boys and girls of Secondary Schools, a scheme which has the warm support both of the Hellenic and of the Roman Society.

No pioneer could have led the way with greater success than Mr. Hallam. If his subject is fascinating in itself, its fascination grows still more irresistible in his skilful hands. As full of lore as any Sibyl he guides us through the scenes in which Horace used to delight. A brief introduction to Horace's early life, and we are led up the Vale of Digentia to meet the poet himself, *corporis exigui, praecanum, solibus aptum*, on his farm near the Fountain of Bandusia and the Temple of Vacuna. A short rest while we listen to a rapid review of Horace's writings (and to bridge over the passing years), and now we go downstream to Tibur, 'where

Anio leaps in foam,' with its memories of 'resounding Albunea' and the Grove of Tiburnus—it should be said, in passing, that Mr. Hallam makes out a strong case for locating the site of Horace's villa at Tibur within the walls of the old monastery of S. Antonio. At both places we visit the poet's favourite haunts with him, and we bask in the sunshine of his genial company and of the Sabine landscape, so vividly transmitted by the beautiful illustrations.

All too soon we wake from this happy dream.

Every boy and girl reading Latin at school will long to own this little book to help to call back delightful memories of Mr. Hallam's 'talk,' which of course they will all have already listened to, revelling in his pictures.

For the guidance of those teachers who wish to avail themselves of this lecture or of others in the series, we would add that their 'distribution' is undertaken by the combined Hellenic and Roman Societies from their office at 19, Bloomsbury Square, London, and members of either Society may use them or allow them to be used by others on payment of a small fee.

G. E. K. BRAUNHOLTZ.

Saggi Glottologici. Contributo allo studio del latino arcaico (Biblioteca di MOYSEION, vol. iv.). By ENRICO COCCHIA. One vol. Pp. vii + 364. Napoli: Rondinella e Loffredo, 1924 (but actually published at the end of 1923). Lire 35.00.

IN this volume the Professor of Latin Literature in the University of Naples, whose industry is demonstrated by the number and bulk of his published works, has brought together a number of his occasional papers, many of them studies in Latin phonology and etymology, though some deal with Greek, and others with literary rather than linguistic subjects; finally, a few old reviews of books (even of elementary school books) are thrown in to fill up at the end. The earliest paper is dated 1881, the latest 1923; apparently all have been published before, and they are now reprinted without alteration. A judicious selection, and a rigorous revision, were both of them essential, but have not been made; the result was inevitable. It was not worth while, even in a country where printing is cheap, to reprint unrevised an essay, written more than forty years ago, on the assimilation of dentals to -ss- (-s-) in Latin, to which everyone is duly directed by the reference in Stolz, but which no one wants to read nowadays. And what is gained by reprinting in 1923 an essay first published in 1923?

It is difficult to estimate the good and bad in such a *farrago* as this. But since the author seems to regard his volume as mainly a contribution to the study of Old Latin, I may not unfairly take the same view and confine myself to those parts of it which do not bewray its title. Here and there is a flash of light. Thus, the Venetic gloss *ceuae*: 'uaccae Altinae (humilis staturae)' from Columella 6.24.5, where the editors have generally altered *Altinae* to *Alpinae*, is vindicated (p. 169) by a comparison with modern Venetian (Cocchia means *Venezia*, though he prints *Veneria*) of Venezia Veneta

and Venezia Tridentina *il ceo, la cea* meaning 'piccolo, piccola.' But such flashes are rare. No one can follow Cocchia through the black darkness of the article in which he seeks to show that final -s in Latin now and again ('questi fenomeni della vocalizzazione di una consonante son sempre sporadici' are his very words, p. 40) turned into -i, e.g., he argues, in the genitive singular of o-stems. Nearly all the linguistic papers show the same lack of strict scientific method. Does Professor Cocchia imagine that anyone besides himself seriously rejects the overwhelming evidence from the dialects (this he simply ignores) as well as from Latin itself, which proves, beyond doubt, the existence of a universal first-syllable accent in pro-ethnic Italic? To enumerate all the old-fashioned, long since out-of-date views of Professor Cocchia would fill pages.

I have noted a curious slip: on p. 187 Matthew Arnold's 'On Translating Homer' is described as 'la traduzione inglese di Omero curata da Mattia Arnold.' And misprints are very numerous. There is an index, incomplete, and not always accurate, of words and subjects; but for its shortcomings Professor Cocchia is not himself directly responsible.

J. WHATMOUGH.

- (1) *The Solution of the Homeric Question*. The original *Iliad* and its successive expansions as determined by upwards of 3,000 repeated and adapted lines and half-lines together with inter-borrowings with the *Odyssey*. By ROBINSON SMITH. Pp. 22. London: Grafton and Co., 1923. 2s.
- (2) *Epilegomena ad Homerum*, sive observationes ad elocutionem et compositionem *Iliadis* et ad Quaestionem Homericam, scriptis JULIUS GYOMLAY. Pp. 64. Budapest, 1923.

THE subtitle of the first book shows what its author claims to have done and how. The method is far from new, but no reference is made to the copious literature of the subject, and the only commentator quoted is Leaf, who is allowed to be 'usually right.' We are to accept the author's decisions in the 3,000 instances. But experience of the excesses of the monstrous regiment of German Repetition-Mongers has taught us to be wary. The method has never given any results, for there is wide scope for difference of opinion. That will be clear to anyone who examines a batch of instances on page 3 of the present pamphlet, in which borrowing or imitation is argued from 'some mistake in grammatical construction.' It would be a waste of time and space to expose them in detail. The chief aids invoked are the digamma and hiatus. The neglects of *F* in the Original *Iliad* are easily disposed of; given the same licence, will there be any difficulty in purging the rest of the poem? There are authorities who have held that *F* is useless as a test, and surely, before any result can be expected, the difference between the two extreme digamma schools must be composed. Exactly the same may be said of hiatus, for which Brugmann's work noticed in *C.Q.* XVII. 13 may be referred to, and I find reason to doubt

whether the author of the present pamphlet is clear as to *hiatus illicitus*. 'The solution' of the great Question has still to be discovered.

The author of the second work has been a student of Homer for forty years, and presents it as an epilogue to his previous studies. He is a sturdy opponent of unity, and in a certain amount of agreement with Wilamowitz, Bethe, and Mülder. There was an original poem on the Wrath, which has been expanded into our *Iliad*, generally by inferior hands. The indications of this are provided by the *elocutio*, taking the word in a wide sense, and by the *inventio et compositio*. He discusses the Repetitions, the Speeches, and the Similes, and other features, and suggests the necessity for fresh enumerations. To the Speeches he seems to attach an exaggerated importance. That they are worthy of close study, especially in regard to the differences between them and Narrative, is certain, but that a comparison of them *inter se* with reference to the *fontes psychologici* will produce any result of value may well be doubted. It is admitted that it is very difficult to draw conclusions from the *propria elocutionis* alone. The structure must also be examined, and an analysis discloses discrepancies which are to Dr. Gyomlay's mind fatal to unity. The more it is examined, the more *artificiosa et tortuosa* the construction appears. To take one example, he cannot ascribe to the author of the original poem the introduction of the 'gods of comedy'—*totum fere deorum illum gregem*. He can admire the nod of Zeus, but to combine it with a description of the lord of Olympus in terror of his spouse, and for that reason dismissing the suppliant Thetis, makes a very silly picture. And yet Achæan hearers might, it may be suggested, approve even as modern readers enjoy. Other *Unebenheiten*, mostly standing difficulties, are referred to, but cannot be discussed here. I will only note that the case is stated with confidence, but also, as Dr. Gyomlay claims, *sine ira et studio*. It is doubtless our misfortune that his earlier work is not well known in this country.

A. SHEWAN.

Roman Home Life and Religion. A Reader, by H. L. ROGERS and T. R. HARLEY. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923. 6s. net.

THE idea of this selection is very happy. The student needs to be reminded that the Romans were something besides politicians, lawyers, and soldiers, and it would be hard to find a better way of showing him this than the present work provides. It is divided into ten parts: love of home, the Roman house, birthday ceremonies, childhood, amusements and pets, work, marriage, meals, illness and death, religion. Under each of these headings there is a number of extracts, for the most part in the original Latin, but in certain cases in an English translation. At the end is a body of short but useful notes. Among the English parts are a few translations from Plutarch: the Latin authors represented, either in the original or in translation, are Plautus, Cicero, Lucretius, Catullus, Sallust, Virgil, Horace, Tibullus, Propertius, Ovid,

Livy, Phaedrus, Seneca, Petronius, Pliny the Younger, Martial, Juvenal, Tacitus, Suetonius, Gellius, the Vulgate, Augustine, with one or two notable inscriptions. The volume has already been prescribed for a large class in one of our universities. A. SOUTER.

Étude sur 'tamen,' conjonction adversative, et son passage au sens causal, avec remarques comparatives sur les particules 'sed, autem, nam, enim': thèse . . . de l'Université de Lausanne. Par JACQUELINE DE LA HARPE. 1923.

THIS thesis is a neat piece of work of over a hundred pages. The writer knows the newer works on Latin grammar, and furnishes a considerable bibliography. She does not attempt the impossible task of reviewing the whole of Latin literature, but starting with the republican period, she illustrates the uses of *tamen* by carefully selected examples: the causal *tamen* appears here and there in Cicero's letters, Petronius, and Tacitus' *Dialogus*, but is entirely absent from the main stream of correct Latin. The analysis of the examples of causal *tamen* is admirable, and a good illustration of the psychological treatment of syntactical points, which is being increasingly employed. Among the later writers the author refers particularly to Sulpicius Severus. As the title of the thesis indicates, the same sort of treatment is extended to certain other particles. The writer, probably through inexperience, seems to cast doubt on the possibility of confusion between *autem* and *enim* as the result of wrong resolution of the insular abbreviation symbols. A. SOUTER.

M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia. Fasc. i: Incerti Auctoris De Ratione Dicendi ad C. Herennium lib. iv. iterum recensuit F. MARX. Lipsiae: Teubner, 1923. 3 shillings.

MARX'S large edition of the *Ad Herennium*, which appeared as long ago as 1894, did much to establish a reputation which has since been enhanced by the well-known editions of Filaster, Lucilius, and Celsus. A very hearty welcome should be extended to this second edition, which appears in the *Bibliotheca Teubneriana*, and is intended to replace Friedrich's text in that series. The interesting and up-to-date preface contains the usual account of the interrelation of manuscripts, and also a most interesting list of the abbreviations that appear in the manuscripts. The only criticism which one feels inclined to offer refers to the orthography. It is as certain as anything can be that the writer of the *Ad Herennium* used the older type of orthography. The editor rightly therefore reads, for example, *quor* (III. 23, § 38, p. 103, l. 4), but in many other places where the author must have used ancient forms Marx does not risk printing them (for example, he gives *alicuius*, not *aliquoius*, at IV. 5, § 8, p. 112, l. 21). No classical scholar should be without this book, and perhaps some young student will take up the task of writing an explanatory commentary on the *Ad Herennium*.

A. SOUTER.

Cornélius Népos, Oeuvres: texte établi et traduit par Anne-Marie Guillemin. Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1923. 16 francs.

AS the oldest surviving manuscript of Nepos, the Gudianus of Wolfenbüttel, is no older than the end of the twelfth century, there will probably be room for many recensions of the text in time to come, but Mdle. Guillemin has taken much trouble in the preparation of hers. She has, for instance, examined the Paris manuscripts and compiled a substantial critical apparatus; she has also consulted M. Louis Havet, M. Émile Chatelain, and M. Henri Goelzer. The edition, well printed on good paper, is, in consequence, doubtless the best critical edition of the author in existence; the commentary of A. van Staveren, ed. alt. (Lugd. Bat. 1773) retains its value. A. SOUTER.

Studia Ammianae: Dissertatio Inauguralis: scripsit HARALD HAGENDAHL. Uppsala, 1921. 7½ Swedish kr.

THE publication of Professor C. U. Clark's epoch-making edition of Ammianus (Berlin, 1910-1913) will naturally lead to many investigations. Among these, lexicographical and syntactical work is urgently needed. Dr. Hagendahl's work is most scholarly and useful. The topics which he discusses are these: Ammian as an imitator of Virgil, his use of poetic words, the 'poetic' plural, and numerous other lexical and syntactical peculiarities. All these topics are illustrated by copious references to works enumerated in the excellent and comprehensive bibliography which introduces the work. Statius (*Silvae* ii. 4, 30) might be added to the authorities for *querulus* (p. 45), and it might have been mentioned that metrical considerations dictated the use of *foecula* (p. 91) and *proelia* (p. 94) instead of the singular. Attention may be called to Hagendahl's (German) article 'Zu Ammianus Marcellinus' in *Strena Philologica Upsaliensis* (1922).

A. SOUTER.

Auswahl aus den Werken des Gregor von Tours. Herausgegeben von H. MORFF. Heidelberg, Winter, 1922. 1s. 4d.

THIS volume constitutes the sixth part of the useful series *Sammlung vulgärlateinischer Texte*. Copies of the collected works of Gregory of Tours are rather expensive, and it was a happy idea to include this admirable selection in a series that already comprises Petronius, Aetharia, and other writers. The editor very properly takes his text of the *Historia Francorum* from the beautiful edition of Omont and Collon (Paris, 1913). The student of Gregory will naturally employ the well-known monograph of Max Bonnet on the language, and the German translation of Siegmund Hellmann (3 vols., Leipzig, 1911-1913) for light on the subject-matter.

A. SOUTER.

Julian of Toledo 'De Vitiis et Figuris' [St. Andrews University Publications, No. XV.] By Professor W. M. LINDSAY. London: Milford, 1922. 2s. 6d. net.

THIS, the first critical edition of Julian's booklet, is a companion to much of the recent work of Lindsay and his school. Four MSS. (not counting the *Liber Glossarum*) are used as the basis of the text. Julian's work is mostly based on earlier writings still extant, but the manuscripts are interesting as furnishing clear proof that a Spanish archetype lies behind them. A neat piece of work with a useful index. A. SOUTER.

Francisci Petrarchae Epistolae Selectae. Edidit A. F. JOHNSON, B.A. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923. Pp. x+276. 8s. 6d. net.

THE encouragement given to the publication of Mr. P. S. Allen's *Selections from Erasmus* may have influenced the Oxford Press to publish the present (considerably larger) volume of selected epistles of Petrarch. In any case the volume is very welcome, whether the reader's chief interest be in Petrarch as a classical scholar, or not. The letters are preceded by a chronological summary, and followed by a body of useful (and necessary) notes, a good bibliography, and an index. The editor is thoroughly competent for his task, and has produced a charming volume. The exact reference to Augustine, *Confessions*, namely, x. 8, § 15, might have been given on p. 17. l. 132. On p. 27 does not *Claravallensibus* refer to Cistercians rather than Benedictines? On p. 217 'Achilles' should be 'Achillas,' and it might have been stated that the reference is to the period of Pompey's death (48 B.C.) A. SOUTER.

Greek and Roman Portraits in English Country Houses. By FREDERIK POULSEN. Translated by Rev. G. C. RICHARDS, Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. One vol. Pp. 112. 112 plates, 57 figures. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1923. £4 4s. net.

FORTY years ago Michaelis, in his *Ancient Marbles*, enumerated most of the portraits (except those at Sion House) here recorded; but archaeology has advanced far in that interval, unillustrated descriptions are of little use, and it was time the ground was resurveyed. Dr. Poulsen's book contains 112 selected portraits from nine different collections, including (in defiance of the title) Lansdowne House and the Soane Museum. All are of Roman workmanship, though a score are copies of Greek originals; all, except the fine bust of Thucydides at Holkham, are unfamiliar; and even the Thucydides is here for the first time adequately published. Dr. Poulsen has therefore done us a great service, for in his scholarly descriptions and excellent half-tone plates a large mass of unknown material becomes available for study. Not all of it is of equal importance, but it includes some interesting portraits of known persons, the general artistic level is respectable, and there are some few outstanding pieces. It is much to be hoped that more

archaeologists will follow Dr. Poulsen's example and publish other sections of the important antiquities which remain more or less inaccessible in English private collections.

The book is finely and accurately produced, as indeed we are entitled to expect both of the press and of the price; but a Greek quotation on p. 83 has gone astray. A. S. F. GOW.

Theories of Macrocosms and Microcosms in the History of Philosophy. By G. P. CONGER. Pp. xviii+146. New York: Columbia University Press; Milford, Oxford University Press, 1922. Cloth. 10s. 6d.

THIS volume reviews 'theories,' from Thales to the present day, that 'portions of the world which vary in size exhibit similarities in structures and processes, indicating that one portion imitates another or others on a different scale.' Chapter I. is devoted to the 'emergence' of such theories in the Greek and Graeco-Roman world. The author declines to reconstruct any of the pre-Socratic systems, confining himself to quotable fragments of testimonies which appear to imply views of this kind. The danger of this method is that the impression may be conveyed that the macro-microcosmic analogy is a 'theory' which gradually gains ground, whereas it is rather an unquestioned assumption of mythical and semi-mythical thought which survives in philosophy, and is not in the early stages an object of explicit reflection. Its influence is most pervasive when it is least talked about. Some omissions may be noted. The Hippocratic Corpus, which the author seems to know only from Gomperz' *Greek Thinkers*, receives meagre treatment. Plato, *Phaedrus*, 270 c, is not quoted. Empedocles' doctrine that Love in the universe is the same as love in living creatures might be mentioned. A few translations are misleading—e.g., 'enthusiasms' for τὸ θουοειδὲς in Plato (p. 7); 'finite' and 'infinite' for πέρας and ἀπειρον in the *Philebus*. There is too much reliance on secondary authorities. Citations in the form 'According to Berthelot, Olympiodorus says'... might be avoided by reference to Olympiodorus' text.

The author has shown great industry in collecting a mass of material which will be useful to students of the survival of mythical conceptions in philosophy and science.

F. M. CORNFORD.

Manuel de Linguistique grecque. By ALBERT CARNOY, Professor à l'Université de Louvain. Pp. 426. Louvain (Éditions Universitatis) and Paris (Champion), 1924.

THE scope of this book is very wide: it includes not only a treatment of Greek phonology, morphology, and syntax from the standpoint of Indo-European Comparative Philology, but a chapter entitled *Notions de Stylistique grecque*, resembling one of those manuals of Greek prose composition published in England which the author in his preface dismisses as insufficient for his purpose. The book teems not only with misprints, but with other errors (especially in

the phonology and morphology) for which the printer cannot be blamed. It is asserted, for instance, that 'Ion. *πράσσω*' comes from *πράγ-ω* (p. 21), that *νν* from *νφ* is reduced in Attic to *ν* with compensatory lengthening (*ibid.*), that *φῆρες* (*sic*) like *ἔλληνες* and *οὐρανῖνες* retains the long vowel in its declension (p. 99), that *Ῥίσαρι* comes from *Ῥιδάρι* (p. 140), that *τίνω* is related to Sanskrit *cinomi* 'je perçois,' that Messen. *γράφηντι* corresponds to Att. *γράφωσι* (p. 208, the fact being that Messen. *προγράφηντι* [accent unknown] corresponds to Att. *προγράφωσι*); and on p. 155 the form **δέδφοια* is reconstructed without any mention of *δεῖδω*, so little has Mahlow's reasoning been taken to heart. Sanskrit words are transcribed on two different principles: on the one hand we have *shash*, *teshām*, *lashati*, on the other, *esi*, *cece*, *dvesmi*; even the close proximity of *dvis* and *trish* on p. 121 does not trouble Professor Carnoy. The Avestan transcriptions are no

better: *khshwash* (p. 117) but *fra-xšni* (p. 211). These and other errors betray such a degree of unfamiliarity with the subject as to deprive the book of any just claim to take its place by the side of the well-known works on which it is based.

RODERICK MCKENZIE.

Fontes Historiae Religionis Aegyptiacae. T. HOPFNER. Pars III. Pp. 275 to 475. Bonn: Marcus u. Weber, 1923. \$1.45.

PART III. of this work contains authors from Clement of Rome to Porphyry, thus bringing us down to the opening of the fourth century A.D. In arrangement and appearance it fully maintains the standard set in the two previous volumes. Part IV., which is now promised almost immediately, will complete the work, and will contain name, place, and subject indices to the whole.

T. E. PEET.

OXFORD PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY'S REPORT.

ON November 23, 1923, three papers were read by Mr. Frank Carter. The first, entitled 'A Problem in the Roman Calendar,' dealt with the date of the Ides. Mr. Carter tried to show that (1) the Calends (Greek *νομήνια*) represent the day following the first visibility of the new moon, the latter averaging about 41 hours after the astronomical new moon; (2) the 13th day from this (the 12th by our method of reckoning) will then represent accurately the date of the full moon; (3) the fact that the Ides in March, May, July, October fall on the 13th is due to the fact that these were, in the Pre-Julian Calendar, the only 31-day months, the others, with the exception of February, being 29—the habit of regarding the Ides as 18 days (by Roman reckoning) back from the next Calends had already become standardised.

Mr. Carter's second paper compared Thuc.

III. 30. 3 with Cicero *Ad Att.* V. 20. 3. The passage in Cicero, no less than the accurate translation of the Thucydidean text, especially in view of the prefix in *ἐνοπῶν*, shows (1) that the reading *καυόν* is necessarily right, as against the alternative *καυόν*; (2) that the phrase (*cf.* also Arist. *Eth. Nic.* III. 8. 6) was a proverbial one; (3) that the probable meaning is 'folly,' as in Pind. *Ol.* 3. 81, and Cic. *Ad Att.* VI. 9. 2.

The third paper dealt with Vergil's 'urbe Mycenae' (*Aen.* V. 52). The passage does not mean 'the city of Mycenae,' but 'Mycene's city,' Mycene being the eponymous nymph. So also 'amnis Eridani' (*Aen.* VI. 659), 'mare Hadriae' (Propertius I. 61) and others. Is not, in fact, the 'Genitive of Equivalence' a grammatical myth? Does not 'vox voluptatis' mean not 'the word voluptas,' but 'pleasure's name,' which is, of course, 'voluptas'—and so with other alleged instances?

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

CLASSICAL WEEKLY (NEW YORK).

(1924.)

HISTORY.—May 19. B. W. Henderson, *Life and Principate of the Emperor Hadrian* [London, Methuen, 1923] (W. D. Gray). 'A distinct advance on his only predecessor'; but G. severely criticises H. for omissions and for failure to use much new material.

LITERATURE.—March 24. E. S. Hoernle, *The Problem of the Agamemnon* [Oxford, Blackwell, 1921] (A. E. Phoutrides). P. contributes useful observations on the visibility of distant fire-signals.—April 7. E. S. Hoernle, *Notes on the Text of Aeschylus* [Oxford,

Blackwell, 1921] (A. E. Phoutrides). 'An invaluable contribution towards a true text.' P. analyses H.'s methods.—L. V. Jacks, *St. Basil and Greek Literature* [Washington, D. C., 1922] (T. C. Burgess). Praised: the first volume of a series of patristic studies to be issued by the Catholic University of America.—April 28. M. Rothstein, *Die Elegien des Sextus Propertius: I. Teil* [Berlin, Weidmann, 1920] (A. L. Wheeler). This second edition is a great improvement on the first (1898). W. discusses at length many points in R.'s introduction.—May 5. J. C. Austin, *The Significant Name in Terence* [University of Illinois Press, 1922] (F. G. Ballentine). Not praised.

RELIGION.—May 19. R. M. Peterson, *Cults of Campania* [American Academy in Rome, 1919]. Lily R. Taylor, *Local Cults in Etruria* [American Academy in Rome, 1923] (J. W. Hewitt). Both works are praised as good collections of material, with judicious conclusions.

[The issues of April 21 and May 12 contain lists of articles on classical subjects in non-classical periodicals.]

NEUE JAHRBÜCHER FÜR DAS KLASSISCHE ALTERTUM, ETC.

(LIII./LIV. 2, 3, 1924.)

2. U. Kahrstedt, *Griechisches Staatsrecht. I. Bd. Sparta und seine Symmachie* [Göttingen, 1922] (W. Judeich). Limited in range and excessively juristic. The novelties are mostly disputable; for instance, the view that the Helots were pure Dorians. The book has value, but is too subjective, and rests on shaky foundations.—K. Kunst, *Die Frauengestalten im Attischen Drama* [Vienna and Leipzig, 1922] (J. Geffcken). Excellent on Euripides, much less good on Aeschylus,

Sophocles, and Aristophanes. Tends to modernise.—E. Schmidt, *Archaistische Kunst in Griechenland und Rom* [Munich, 1922] (G. Weicker). Highly praised. Occasional archaism, from religious motives, appears in art even in the early fifth century, especially in Alcámenes; but, as a consistent artistic method, it first appears in the first quarter of the fourth, both in sculpture and on the Panathenaic amphorae. Crude combinations of archaistic heads with realistic bodies, etc., are Roman only.—V. Gardthausen, *Die Alexandrinische Bibliothek, ihr Vorbild, Katalog, Betrieb* [Leipzig, 1922] (E. Bethe). Excellent.—3. V. Coulon and H. van Daele, *Aristophane, Tome I. (Les Acharniens, Les Cavaliers, Les Nuées) texte établi par V. Coulon et traduit par H. van Daele* [Paris, 1923] (A. Körte). The best available text, but seriously defective as a critical edition. The chief MSS. are neither fully nor quite accurately quoted. The translation is good, but French cannot do justice to Aristophanes' language.—W. Dittenberger, *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum . . . nunc tertium edita. Vol. IV., fasc. II.* [Leipzig, 1924] (A. Körte). This fascicule, by H. v. Gaertringen, completes the Index. Altogether admirable.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on Classical Studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

. Excerpts or Extracts from Periodicals and Collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

A Classified Catalogue of the Books, Pamphlets and Maps in the Library of the Societies for the Promotion of Hellenic and Roman Studies. Pp. xv + 336. London: Macmillan, 1924. Boards, 15s. net.

Allen (P. S. et H. M.) *Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami denuo recognitum et auctum. Tom. V. 1522-1524.* Pp. xxiii + 631. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924. Cloth, 28s. net.

Barry (M. I.) *St. Augustine, the Orator. A study of the rhetorical qualities of St. A's Sermones ad Populum.* (The Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, Vol. VI.) Pp. xi + 263. Washington: The Catholic University of America, 1924. Paper.

Bell (H. I.) *Jews and Christians in Egypt. The Jewish troubles in Alexandria and the Athanasian controversy illustrated by texts from Greek papyri in the British Museum.* Edited by H. I. B., with three Coptic texts edited by W. E. Crum. Pp. xii + 140; 5 plates. London: British Museum, etc., 1924. Cloth.

Bréhier (E.) *Plotin: Ennéades. I. Texte établi et traduit par E. B.* Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1924. Paper.

Brenot (A.) *Phèdre: Fables. Texte établi et*

traduit par A. B. Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1924. Paper.

Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé. No. 3, Avril, 1924; No. 4, Juillet, 1924.

Burnet (J.) *Plato's Euthyphro, Apology of Socrates, and Crito.* Edited with notes. Pp. vii + 298. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.

Campbell (A. Y.) *Horace: a new interpretation.* Pp. xii + 303. London: Methuen, 1924. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.

Campbell (J. M.) *The influence of the Second Sophistic on the style of the sermons of St. Basil the Great.* (The Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, Vol. II.) Pp. xvi + 156. Washington: The Catholic University of America, 1922. Paper.

Chase (G. H.) *Greek and Roman Sculpture in American Collections.* Pp. xv + 222; 262 illustrations. Cambridge (U.S.A.): Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1924. Cloth and boards, 31s. 6d. net.

Classical Philology, Vol. XIX., No. 1, January, 1924; No. 2, April, 1924.

Cocchia (E.) *La Letteratura latina anteriore all'influenza ellenica. Part I.* Pp. x + 265. Naples: Rondinella and Loffredo, 1924. Paper, L. 12.

- Colson* (F. H.) *M. Fabii Quintiliani Institutionis Oratoriae Liber I.* Edited, with Introduction and Commentary, by F. H. C. Pp. xcvi + 208. Cambridge: University Press, 1924. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Cookson* (G. M.) *Aeschylus: Agamemnon, Choephoroe, Eumenides, rendered into English verse.* Pp. 160. London: Chapman and Hall, 1924. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Cooper* (L.) *An Aristotelian Theory of Comedy, with an adaptation of the Poetics, and a translation of the 'Tractatus Coislinianus.'* Pp. xxi + 323. Oxford: Blackwell, 1924. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Corpus Inscriptionum Etruscarum.* Supplementi Fasc. I.: Libri lintei Etrusci fragmenta Zagrabinsia, adiuvante O. A. Danielsson editit G. Herbig. Pp. 33, 12 plates. Vol. II., sect. 1, fasc. 2 (tit. 5211-5326), cur. O. A. D. Pp. 105 to 182. Leipzig: Barth, 1919-21 and 1923. Paper (in cardboard portfolios), 12s. and 20s.
- Cunliffe* (R. J.) *A Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect.* Pp. ix + 445. London: Blackie, 1924. Cloth, 30s. net.
- De Fulco* (V.) *Sull' Idillio Decimo di Teocrito.* Pp. 18. Naples: F. Sangiovanni, 1923. Paper.
- Denniston* (J. D.) *Greek Literary Criticism. (The Library of Greek Thought.)* Pp. xli + 224. London and Toronto: Dent, 1924. Cloth, 5s. net.
- De Villiers* (M.) *The Numeral-Words. Their origin, meaning, history, and lesson.* Pp. 124. London: H. F. and G. Witherby; Cape Town, etc.: Juta and Co., 1923.
- Diehl* (E.) *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres.* Fasc. I. Pp. 80. Berlin: Weidmann, 1924. Paper, 3.75 Marks.
- ΔΙΚΑΙΟΘΥΝΗ. 'Αθήναι, 15 Μαρτίου, 1924.
- Dunlap* (J. E.) *The Office of the Grand Chamberlain in the Later Roman and Byzantine Empires. (University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, Vol. XIV.)* Pp. viii + 165-324. New York: The Macmillan Co. (London: Macmillan), 1924. Paper, \$1 net.
- Elderkin* (G. W.) *Kantharos. Studies in Dionysiac and kindred cult.* Pp. 241; 10 plates. Princeton: University Press (London: Milford), 1924. Cloth, 52s. 6d. net.
- Fell* (R. A. L.) *Etruria and Rome.* Pp. vii + 182. Cambridge: University Press, 1924. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.
- Ford* (H. G.) *Latin Unseen Traps. A list of Latin words easily confused.* Pp. 30. London: Methuen, 1924.
- Gercke* (A.) and *Norden* (E.) *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft.* 1. Band. 3. Heft: Griechische Literatur, von E. Bethe und M. Pohlenz, pp. 199. 4. Heft: Römische Literatur, von E. Norden, pp. 118. 5. Heft: Christliche Literatur, von H. Lietzmann, pp. 36. 6. Heft: Sprache, von P. Kretschmer, pp. 121. 7. Heft: Griechische Metrik, von P. Maas, pp. 32. 8. Heft: Römische Metrik, von Fr. Vollmer, pp. 26.
9. Heft: Griechische Epigraphik, von F. Hiller von Gaertringen; Papyruskunde, von W. Schubart; Griechische Palaeographie, von P. Maas, pp. 81. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1924. Kartonnirt, 6.40, 3, 1.20, 3.20, 0.80, 0.80, 2.80 goldmarks.
- Giannelli* (G.) *Culti e Miti della Magna Grecia.* Pp. xiii + 360. Florence: Bemporad, 1924. Paper. Price in Florence 48 lire.
- Hallard* (J. H.) *Theocritus, Bion and Moschus translated into English verse, with an introduction on Greek bucolic poetry.* Pp. xvi + 220. (Broadway Translations.) London: Routledge; New York: Dutton. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Hardy* (E. G.) *Some Problems in Roman History. Ten essays bearing on the administrative and legislative work of Julius Caesar.* Pp. xi + 330. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924. Cloth, 18s. net.
- Hardy* (E. G.) *The Catilinarian Conspiracy in its Context: a re-study of the evidence.* Pp. 115. Oxford: Blackwell, 1924. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Harrington* (K. P.) *Catullus and his Influence.* Pp. ix + 245. (Our Debt to Greece and Rome.) London, etc.: Harrap, 1924. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Haverfield* (F.) *The Roman Occupation of Britain, being six Ford Lectures delivered by F. H., now revised by G. Macdonald. With a notice of H.'s life and a list of his writings.* Pp. 304. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924. Cloth, 18s. net.
- Heikel* (I. A.) *Griechische Inschriften sprachlich erklärt.* Pp. viii + 120. Helsingfors: Akademische Buchhandlung, 1924. Paper, 80.50.
- Hofstner* (T.) *Fontes Historiae Religionis Aegyptiacae, collegit T. H. Pars III. auctores a Clemente Romano usque ad Porphyrium continens.* Pp. 275 to 475. Bonn: Marcus und Weber, 1923. Paper.
- Hopkin* (J. C.) *A Handbook of Greek Black-figured Vases, with a chapter on Red-figured Southern Italian vases.* Pp. xxiii + 509, 133 planches, 217 figures. Paris: Champion, 1924. Cloth, 200 fr.
- Irvine* (A. L.) *The Loves of Dido and Aeneas, being the Fourth Book of Aeneid, translated into English verse by Richard Fanshawe. Edited, with notes, by A. L. I.* Pp. 131. Oxford: Blackwell, 1924. Cloth, 6s. net.
- Jackson* (J.) *Hannibal's Invasion of Italy, being Livy, Books XXI. and XXII., partly in the original and partly in translation, edited by J. J.* Pp. 180. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.
- Jacoby* (F.) *Die griechische Moderne.* Pp. 24. Berlin: Weidmann, 1924. Paper, 0.80 M.
- James* (H. R.) *Our Hellenic Heritage. Vol. II., Part IV. The Abiding Splendour.* Pp. xv + 274-527. Maps and Illustrations. London: Macmillan, 1924. Cloth, 4s.

- Jespersen* (O.) *The Philosophy of Grammar*. Pp. 359. London: Allen and Unwin, 1924. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Jobbé-Duval* (E.) *Les Morts Malfaisants: 'Larvae, Lemures' d'après le droit et les croyances populaires des Romains*. Pp. xi + 334. Paris: Librairie de la S.A. du Recueil Sirey, 1924. Paper, 25 fr.
- Kent* (R.) *Language and Philology*. Pp. vii + 174. (Our Debt to Greece and Rome.) London, etc.: Harrap, 1924. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Knox* (R. A.) *Virgil, Aeneid, Books VII. to IX., partly in the original and partly in English verse translation, edited by R. A. K.* Pp. 159. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.
- Lattey* (C.) *Texts illustrating ancient Ruler-worship*. Pp. viii + 23. English translation, with explanations. Pp. viii + 32. (Texts for Students, Nos. 35 and 35a). London: S.P.C.K., 1924. Paper, 6d. each.
- Lehman* (L.) *Quantitative Implications of the Pyrrhic Stress, especially in Plautus and Terence*. Pp. 81. University of Virginia, 1924. Paper.
- Lucas* (F. L.) *Euripides and his Influence*. Pp. xv + 188. (Our Debt to Greece and Rome.) London, etc.: Harrap, 1924. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Mackail* (J. W.) *What is the good of Greek? A public lecture given at Melbourne*. Pp. 22. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924. Paper, 1s. 6d. net.
- Marris* (W.) *Catullus translated by Sir W. M., with the Latin text*. Pp. 169. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Masqueray* (P.) *Sophocle, Tome II.: Les Trachiniennes, Philoctète, Oedipe à Colone, Les Limiers. Texte établi et traduit par P. M.* Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres', 1924. Paper.
- Meyer* (P. M.) *Griechische Papyrusurkunden der Hamburger Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek. Band I., Heft 3*. Pp. 211-269. Leipzig: Teubner, 1911-1924. Geheftet, M. 12.
- Owen* (S. G.) *P. Ovidi Nasonis Tristium Liber Secundus*. Edited, with an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary. Pp. ix + 296. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Pease* (A. S.) *M. Tulli Ciceronis de Divinatione Liber Secundus. Part II*. Pp. 463 to 656. University of Illinois Press, Urbana, 1923. Paper, \$1.50.
- Report of the Joint Committee on Grammatical Nomenclature*. Pp. x + 75. Washington: The National Education Association. Paper, 25 cents, post paid.
- Reynolds* (G.) *The Clausulae in the De Civitate Dei of St. Augustine*. (The Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, Vol. VIII.) Pp. ix + 67. Washington: The Catholic University of America, 1924. Paper.
- Rostrup* (E.) *Attic Tragedy in the Light of Theatrical History*. Pp. 166. Copenhagen, etc.: Gyldendal (London: Constable), 1924. Paper, 7s. 6d. net.
- Schmitt* (A.) *Untersuchungen zur allgemeinen Akzentlehre, mit einer Anwendung auf den Akzent des Griechischen und Lateinischen*. Pp. xv + 209. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1924. Paper, 5.50 Marks.
- Showerman* (G.) *Eternal Rome. The city and its people from the earliest times to the present day*. Two vols. Pp. xi + 650. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Milford), 1924. Cloth, 48s. net.
- Stanley* (A. A.) *Greek Themes in Modern Musical Settings*. (University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, Vol. XV.) Pp. xxii + 385; 10 plates, 24 figures in the text. New York: The Macmillan Co. (London: Macmillan), 1924. Cloth, \$4 net.
- Stenzel* (J.) *Zahl und Gestalt bei Platon und Aristoteles*. Pp. viii + 146. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1924. Kartoniert, 6 goldmarks (Halbfranz, about 7.20).
- Streitberg* (Festschrift für W.) *Stand und Aufgaben der Sprachwissenschaft*. Pp. xxi + 683. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1924. Paper, 22 Marks (bound, 24.50).
- Swoboda* (H.) *Zwei Kapitel aus dem griechischen Bundesrecht*. Pp. 74. (Akad. d. Wiss. in Wien, Phil.-hist. Klasse. Sitzungsberichte, 199. Band, 2. Abhandlung.) Wien and Leipzig: Holder-Pichler-Tempsky A.-G., 1924. Paper, 3.50 Swiss francs.
- Symbolae Osloenses (olim Arctoe)*. Fasc. II. Pp. 74. Christianiae in aed. Some et Soc., 1924.
- Tanzer* (H. H.) *The Villas of Pliny the Younger*. Pp. xxii + 152; 56 plates. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Milford), 1924. Cloth and boards, 12s. 6d. net.
- The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. XLV. 1. Whole No. 177. January, February, March, 1924. No. 178. April, May, June, 1924.
- Torr* (C.) *Hannibal crosses the Alps*. Pp. viii + 40. Cambridge: University Press, 1924. Cloth, 2s. 6d. net.
- Van Groningen* (B. A.) *Le Gymnasiarque des Métropoles de l'Égypte Romaine*. Pp. viii + 164. Groningen: Noordhoff, 1924. Paper, 4.50 florins; bound, 5.50.
- Way* (A. S.) *The Aeneid of Virgil in English Verse. Vol. II. Books IV.-VI.* Pp. 153. London: Macmillan, 1924. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Weber* (S. H.) *Anthimus, De Observatio [sic] Ciborum*. Text, commentary, and glossary, with a study of the Latinity. A dissertation presented to the Faculty of Princeton University. P. 152. Leiden: Brill, 1924.
- Westaway* (K. M.) *Selections from Plautus with introduction and notes*. (Pitt Press Series.) Cambridge: University Press, 1924. Cloth, 3s.

t of
gen,
224.

men
den
men.
224.

and
the
few
on :

ern
gan
Pp.
ext.
on :

und
and
old-

Auf-
83.
22

ch-
iss.
nte,
and
G.,

II.
oc.,

the
few
on :
net.
Vol.
ary,
ne,

Pp.
ess,

des
ii +
per,

lish
53-
i.

sic]
ary,
ion
ver-

tus
ress
224.